FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-035
Tuesday
23 February 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-035

CONTENTS

23 February 1988

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Gorbachev, IAEA Head Exchange Messages 1
  Blix Message to Gorbachev, Reagan 1
  Gorbachev Message to Blix *[PRAVDA 23 Feb]* 1
Shalygin on Gorbachev Speech, Arms Control 1
Akhromeyev Views Prospects for Arms Control *[APN MILITARY BULLETIN No 2]* 2
Negotiator Sees 'Possibility' of Geneva Progress *[ZA RUBEZHOM No 7]* 4
Bogachev Denounces INF 'Compensation' Plans 4
Security Concerns of On-Site Inspections Noted *[Dadyants in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 16 Feb]* 5
Galvin Remarks Cause 'Confusion, Alarm' in FRG *[Yakhontov in PRAVDA 16 Feb]* 6
Socialist Countries Discuss Nuclear Exports 7

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Pact Foreign Ministers Meet in Prague 8
  Shevardnadze Leaves for Meeting 8
  Shevardnadze Arrives 8
  Participants Listed 8

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Vienna NATO-Pact Disarmament Talks Continue 9
  Kashlev Cited on Future Talks 9
  Czech Delegation Proposal 9
  Mediterranean Security Viewed 9
NATO Military 'Compensation' Idea Denounced *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Feb]* 10
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' *[Andrianov, Agayants, Kassis]* 12

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Gorbachev, Shultz Meet, Conduct Talks *[PRAVDA 23 Feb]* 18
Shultz Assesses Meetings at Press Conference 19
  Calls Talks 'Valuable' 20
Shevardnadze Press Conference on U.S. Talks 21
  Further Shevardnadze Remarks 22
Ryzhkov, Shultz Discuss Trade, Economic Links *[PRAVDA 23 Feb]* 23
Zorin Interviews Shultz on Moscow Talks 24
Shultz-Shevardnadze Talks End With Statement 25
  Joint Statement Published *[PRAVDA 23 Feb]* 25
Dobrynin, Powell Hold 'Constructive' Talks 26
Vorontsov, Other Officials See Shultz Off 27
Karpov on Significance of Shultz Visit 27
Pogodin Assesses Shultz Talks in Moscow 27
Glazunov Assesses Talks With U.S. in Moscow 28
U.S. Ratification Hearings Continue in Congress 29
Bush Remarks on INF Treaty Reported 29
U.S. Response to Afghanistan Initiative Viewed 29
Reagan Discusses Draft Budget in Radio Address 30
U.S. Asia-Pacific Bases Linked to SDI *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Feb]* 30
Significance, Future of U.S. Foreign Bases 32

China

Yazov Sees Improvement in Chinese Ties 32
Shipping Experts Leave for Border River Talks *[Khabarovsk]* 33
Wu Xueqian Fetes Iraq's Foreign Minister 'Aziz 33
Fedorov Lauds PRC Support for Mideast Peace 33
Li Peng Denies Economic Reform Slowdown *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Feb]* 33
Trade Journal Studies PRC Joint Ventures 34

Northeast Asia

No Tae-u Announces New ROK Government 34
New U.S. Military Bases in S. Korea Deplored *[IZVESTIYA 15 Feb]* 34
Carlucci Report, Strategy for Japan Viewed *[Dmitriyev]* 35
Problems in Economic Cooperation With MPR *[PRAVDA 8 Feb]* 35

Near East & South Asia

Najibullah Speaks at Monument Unveiling *[PRAVDA 22 Feb]* 37
Polyakov Brings Gorbachev Message to Saudi King 37
U.S. 'Diplomatic Offensive' on Mideast Condemned *[Alekseyev]* 37
'Arafat Speaks to UN Human Rights Commission *[Kosinskiy in IZVESTIYA 22 Feb]* 38

Sub-Saharan Africa

Nigerian President Receives Gorbachev Message 39
Briefs: 39
    Ambassador to the Gambia 39
    Aid to Ethiopia 39

East Europe

Yakovlev Sees Off Gromyko for Hungarian Visit 39
    Further on Departure 39
    Nemeth Meets Gromyko 39
    Hungarian Reportage *[cross-reference]* 40
Hungary's Marjai Views Treaty Anniversary *[PRAVDA 18 Feb]* 40
Hungary's Kadar Greets Moscow Radio Club 41
CPSU Delegation Meets With LCY Aides *[PRAVDA 22 Feb]* 41
Orzechowski Stops Over En Route to India 42
Self-Management Bodies Hold Warsaw Conference *[PRAVDA 22 Feb]* 42
Zhivkov Holds Talks With Greece's Papandreou 42
Bulgarian Trade Union Delegation Visits *[TRUD 21 Feb]* 43

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Comparison of Gorbachev Plenum Speech 44
Zaykov Visits Moscow's Cheremushkinskiy Rayon 44
Deputy Minister Voronin Awarded Order of Lenin 44
Koksanov Named Shipbuilding Industry Minister 44
Latvian Founder of 'Helsinki-86' To Leave 44
More on Gromyko Address to Lithuanian Officials *[Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA 6 Feb]* 45
Supreme Court Plenum Discusses Housing Disputes *[IZVESTIYA 10 Feb]* 51
Demonstration in Soviet Armenia Reported *[Vienna]* 52
Uzbek Central Committee Plenum Reported *[Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA 31 Jan]* 52
Kursk Obkom 'Authoritarian' Methods Criticized *[IZVESTIYA 16 Feb]* 53
Kazakh Supreme Soviet Elects Presidium Chairman *[IZVESTIYA 10 Feb]* 54
Former Kazakh Party Chief's Aide Sentenced *[TRUD 14 Feb]* 55
New Style Party Report Meetings Assessed *[PRAVDA 16 Feb]* 56

Minister Interviewed on Nuclear Power Safety
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 10 Feb] 58
Public 'Not Yet Ready' To Debate Psychiatry *[TRUD 16 Feb]* 60
New Rubric for Former 'Taboo' Topics *[IZVESTIYA 10 Feb]* 63

Scientific

'Mir' Cosmonauts Prepare for Spacewalk 63
Soviet Participation 'Highlight' of Space Forum 64
All-Union Science Conference Opens in Moscow 64

Military

Army, Navy Celebrate 70th Anniversary 64
  Zaykov Opens Festivities 64
  Participants Listed 65
  Yazov Addresses Meeting *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Feb]* 65
  Bulgaria's Dzhurov Speaks 74
Gareyev Briefs Journalists on Military Doctrine 75
Military Attache Gives E. Berlin News Briefing *[East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 18 Feb]* 76

Gorbachev, IAEA Head Exchange Messages

Blix Message to Gorbachev, Reagan

LD221325 Moscow TASS in English 1321 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Excerpt] Moscow February 22 TASS—"The INF treaty is but a first, although very important step towards a nuclear-free world and its place in history will largely depend on those even more radical steps on disarmament that are to follow it," says a return message from Mikhail Gorbachev to Hans Blix, director-general of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Blix sent a letter to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in which he highly assessed the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed in Washington, and other accords reached during the summit meeting.

The IAEA director-general sent a similar message to the U.S. President.

Gorbachev Message to Blix

PM231355 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Feb 88 Second Edition p 1

["M.S. Gorbachev's Reply to IAEA Director General H. Blix"]

[Text] Esteemed Mr. Director-General

It is with attention and interest that I have read your letter. Your ideas and considerations are in accord with our understanding of the results of the summit meeting in Washington and the prospects for advancing towards a nuclear-free world.

Indeed, an unprecedented step has been made in Washington from the limitation of weapons to their reduction and elimination. The beginning of real nuclear disarmament has been made.

The significance of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles by far exceeds the framework of its direct contents. The treaty affirms in practice the reality and feasibility of building a safer world, free from nuclear and other weapons of mass annihilation.

We are sure that one should not stop at what has been achieved and we are doing everything possible so that the first half of 1988 sees not only the conclusion of the Soviet-American treaty on the 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons given observance of the ABM treaty, but also the conclusion of the drafting of a convention on the complete and general prohibition of chemical weapons and real tangible steps towards a all-embracing ban on nuclear testing.

One is satisfied to note that you, Mr Director-General, have also come out in favor of the progressive development of the disarmament process this year.

Many other existing agreements on the limitation of arms, including the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and the IAEA safeguards ensuring its effective functioning, have acquired a qualitatively different connotation on the threshold of a new historic era of ridding mankind of nuclear and other weapons of mass annihilation.

The Soviet Union is invariably committed to the objectives and tasks of this treaty. We favor its strict observance and consolidation of the international regime of nuclear weapon non-proliferation established on its basis.

We regard the conclusion of the INF Treaty as a contribution to the fulfillment of the commitments which the nuclear powers, parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, assumed under its Article VI.

No doubt, the INF Treaty is but a first, although very important, step towards a nuclear-free world, and its place in history will largely depend on those even more radical steps on disarmament that are to follow it.

In drafting such accords, we will strive towards including in them the most effective verification provisions. In this area, we think it would be useful to take advantage of the IAEA's control activity in the field of safeguards of nuclear weapon non-proliferation.

I welcome the IAEA's readiness to offer its good offices and assistance in this field. This proposal accords with our understanding of the agency's future contribution to handling the problem of disarmament and shaping an all-embracing system of security and peace.

Mikhail Gorbachev

Shalygin on Gorbachev Speech, Arms Control

LD191750 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 19 Feb 88

[Yuriy Shalygin Commentary]

[Text] We counter the militaristic doctrine on which the policy of strength is based with a concept of a balance of interests and mutual, equal security: This point was made by Mikhail Gorbachev in his speech at a Central Committee meeting of the Soviet Communist Party. More from our commentator Yuriy Shalygin, and this is what he writes:

This terse formula by Mikhail Gorbachev expresses the essence of the Soviet Union's foreign policies, which are based on a new political thinking. A major historic result of the policies is certainly the INF treaty, signed in Washington on 8th December last year, and it is notable how Mikhail Gorbachev described it. On the one hand, this is the beginning of a real disarmament which the Soviet Union wants to have and for this reason we'll be pressing for it so as this treaty on intermediate nuclear forces is followed by accords in other areas of reducing military tension. At the same time, the treaty is a result of efforts by the socialist countries, by other progressive and peace-minded states, by the United Nations, by the Nonaligned Movement and by massive public movements. This is also a consequence of the sensible and active stand of many politicians, businessmen, and military leaders. In short, as Mikhail Gorbachev noted in all fairness, the treaty on the medium- and shorter-range missiles is an indicator of the level the peace potential has reached and a display of the effect the new thinking is having on world politics.

Having given such an appraisal, the Soviet leader found it necessary to warn at the same time that the fact the INF treaty was signed is no reason for complacency. The idea is to have the treaty ratified and go into force. May I remind you that the issue is being considered in the United States Senate and in the USSR Supreme Soviet? It has become obvious that opponents of the better relations with the Soviet Union have not laid down their arms by far. On the contrary, they are rallying forces against the ratification of the treaty in a bid to emasculate it through so-called compensation for the missiles to be scrapped, that is by building up other types of nuclear armaments. A categoric "no" is given again in London, Paris, and at the NATO headquarters in Brussels to renouncing nuclear weapons. As for the United States Administration, it seems to be honoring its commitment and upholding the treaty. At the same time, it heeds the voices from the extreme right-wing forces and not only verbally but also by certain actions along militaristic lines. Thus, the signing of the INF treaty opened up another stage in the combat for disarmament and peace and this is hard struggle, to have the disarmament train keep moving as it is gathering speed. This is a struggle to rule out war from international politics, to save millions of lives, for the survival of humanity. The Soviet Union sees its state interests in that. As Mikhail Gorbachev emphasized, these interests do not run counter to those of the other nations, of the working masses in any other society.

Akhromeyev Views Prospects for Arms Control

PM231221 Moscow APN MILITARY BULLETIN in English No. 2, Jan 88 pp 1-5

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev: "Gorbachev Plan—Two Years After"—footnote states that article is "based on material of a press conference held in Moscow on January 16, 1988"]

[Text] Two years ago the press carried a statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, which we now call a plan for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the 20th century. It will be recalled that the first stage of the plan provided for ending any nuclear explosions before 1990, reduction during 5 to 8 years of 50 percent of nuclear weapons capable of reaching the territories of the United States and the Soviet Union, elimination of medium-range missiles, ballistic and cruise missiles in the European zone, and non-buildup of appropriate nuclear weapons by Britain and France. The subsequent stages—the second to 1995 and the third to 2000—provided for total abolition of nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

Talks are now underway on ending nuclear tests. True, the problem has proved more complex than was first thought. Also talks are in progress on reducing the strategic nuclear arms of the Soviet Union and the United States by 50 per cent. And it ought to be said that much ground has already been covered. There is a mutual desire to have such a treaty prepared by the middle of May or in the first half of 1988. As everyone knows, a treaty has been concluded on total elimination of missiles of intermediate range—ballistic and cruise ones—as well as shorter-range missiles, something envisaged in the plan for the following stages, next five-year periods. And not only in Europe but also globally. That is to say, a good deal has been done in two years.

The USSR Ministry of Defence is asked many questions concerning the ratification of the treaty, which are contained in letters from Soviet people. There are also inquiries made by the Supreme Soviet. The Defence Ministry will have to report on this question to the USSR Supreme Soviet and to explain to Soviet people the correctness of the treaty and its benefits for the Soviet Union and the whole world.

There are questions which have not yet been tackled. We underestimated the fact that in the world there are powerful forces that are against nuclear disarmament in general, and that they act openly and frankly. We also underestimated the fact that new thinking, which presupposes the necessity, or if you like, objective logic of eliminating nuclear weapons, has been adopted by far from all people. New thinking is opposed not only by individual persons, but even by the governments of leading states in the world.

The concept of nuclear arming has become outdated. This is the view of both the political and military leadership of the USSR. A further stockpiling of nuclear weapons objectively creates an increasing danger to peace. But nuclear disarmament too has proved very difficult problem, not that we did not see it. It is necessary that trust be established between states to serve as a basis for reducing nuclear weapons.

The ending of nuclear tests turned out to be the most difficult problem. The point is that the Soviet Union and the United States have fundamentally different approaches to this isssue. We proposed and still propose that nuclear disarmament begin with total prohibition of nuclear tests. And this, in our view, would be right, because nuclear systems would be not only reduced but also get obsolete, which could lead to their quick liquidation.

The U.S. approach is entirely different: so long as nuclear weapons exist, nuclear tests must continue. This creates many difficulties at talks. But progress is there. Thus, three to four days ago an American delegation visited our testing range. Our delegation, too, is to visit a nuclear test site in the United States. This could not have happened and we could not have thought of this only a few years ago.

Talks on strategic armaments are the result of the growth of confidence. At the same time it is necessary to maintain nuclear balance in order that rough parity should not be upset between the strategic nuclear forces of the Soviet Union and the U.S., but at a lower level. The degree of confidence between our countries is not what one would like it to be. This is why we demand from the Americans and the United States from us that there be strict verification of all the agreements signed, there must be no simplification of this process.

There are two major issues to which it is necessary to find solutions: the first concerns the relationship between a future treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms and the ABM Treaty in the form it was signed in 1972. As will be recalled, this relationship has been recorded in the joint statement of Mikhail Gorbachev and President Reagan. There seems to be accord between the sides, but the sides understand differently what is meant by the treaty in the form it was signed in 1972. A lot of work lies ahead in order to reach mutual understanding on this point as well. The second big issue, which will involve much work, concerns air- and sea-launched cruise missiles. I would regard these questions as the main ones.

It is agreed that the time within which there must be no withdrawal from the ABM Treaty is to be negotiated. We speak of ten years, and the American side, of a lesser period.

As regards conventional arms, heads of delegations and military representatives of delegations of Warsaw Treaty member-countries at negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in Europe, held consultations in Moscow recently. I took part in these consultations. We examined problems for the mandate of talks which have not yet been solved between us and representatives of the NATO bloc. Perhaps one of the chief questions not yet agreed and delaying the formulation of the mandate is one on whether talks will be held on reduction of dual-capable systems, that is, systems which could use both nuclear and conventional arms. But these are tactical weapons and talk is about them. Strike aviation, tactical missiles and atomic artillery—all these systems can use both nuclear ammunition and ammunition in conventional configuration. For the present the NATO states do not agree that these systems be considered at talks. We do not understand this stand, because if strike aviation, tactical missiles and artillery are excluded from talks, there will be practically nothing left to talk about.

We thought of how to get out of this situation, how to convince our opponents to find some acceptable solutions. And I must say that we have made some headway on these questions.

There are two principles by which we are guided.

In the case of strategic offensive arms, and these exist both in the Soviet Union and the United States, we are guided by the principle of military equilibrium. Unfortunately, as I have already said, the degree of trust between our countries is such that we must now reduce strategic offensive arms precisely to equal degree so that the military balance is kept between these forces. The two sides are agreed on that. If things continue to move following a 50 percent cut, then perhaps we will go over to other rules.

With regard to conventional armed forces and tactical nuclear forces we are guided by the principle of sufficiency, that is to say, we believe that it is necessary to have just engough strength to ensure reliably the security and defences of the Soviet Union and its allies.

The treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles provides for different numbers of missiles to be destroyed by the Soviet Union and the United States. We are to destroy more missiles. The fact that the Soviet Union has agreed to that shows principle of "reasonable sufficiency".

But we expect a similar approach from other sides too.

As we conduct negotiations with the United States, the problem of U.S. military bases established around the Soviet Union, is getting ever more acute. If one begins with the northeast, it is the Aleutian Islands, unfortunately Japan, the Philippines, the Indian Ocean, some Arab countries, Turkey, Greece, West Germany, and Norway. More than 1,000 such bases are deployed around the Soviet Union. Of course this is a problem weighing heavily on Soviet-American relations. And the fact that the Ikle commission is again raising the question of improving old bases and creating new ones, means that this question will soon appear on the agenda. So far we are not raising it in order not to bring to a halt the entire process of resolving the main problems involved in the reduction of strategic nuclear forces.

Now concerning the publication of figures on military spending. At the present time what is published in this country when we approve the budget concerns money that is spent on the maintenance of the Armed Forces, that is, on the pay of officers and men, on military training, maintenance of equipment, its repairs and other needs. These sums do not include what is spent on weapon acquisition. After a pricing reform is completed in this country, we shall start publishing those figures too. They will comprise everything that concerns military expenditures, that is, we will bring our figures from the point of view of expenditure items in line with those that exist in the world, and the time is not far off.

Negotiator Sees 'Possibility' of Geneva Progress

PM191605 Moscow ZA RUBEZHOM in Russian No. 7, 12-18 Feb 88 (Signed to Press 11 Feb 88) p 5

[Interview with Yuriy Konstantinovich Nazarkin, head of the Soviet delegation to the Geneva disarmament conference, by Vladimir Yordanskiy under the rubric "Topical Reportage": "Encounters in Geneva"; date of interview not given—first paragraph is ZA RUBEZHOM introduction]

[Excerpts] Geneva is one of West Europe's sensitive spots,reacting quickly to changes taking place in the world. It was the venue of the first meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan, which gave a powerful boost to the quest for a more reliable and lasting peace. How are the immediate prospects of this work perceived in Geneva today?

Geneva-Moscow—[passage omitted] The disarmament conference resumed its work in Geneva 2 February. Questions of banning nuclear tests, preventing nuclear war in space, consolidating security guarantees, a universal disarmament program, and several other topics are on its agenda. But its participants' main attention over the last 3-4 years has been focused on the problem of banning chemical weapons. And a substantial positive development has taken place in this sector.

Yuriy Konstantinovich Nazarkin, head of the Soviet delegation, said:

"Our talks have advanced considerably. The text of a future convention banning the development [razrabotka], production, and stockpiling of chemical weapons has already been prepared. It is still not fully agreed, and there are still many parentheses enclosing provisions on which there is no general agreement. At a guess, over 80 percent of the total volume of work has probably been done."

[Yordanskiy]: In these circumstances, how is one to assess the U.S. Administration's decision on the production of binary chemical weapons?

Comrade Nazarkin said that the Americans had planned to destroy obsolete types of chemical weapons by 1994. Their decision to embark on the production of binary weapons, which coincided with the start of the disarmament conference's work, makes it necessary to think about their true intentions.

There is no doubt that the ambiguity of the U.S. stance affects the atmosphere prevailing at the Palais des Nations, where the conference sits. Moreover, its participants must solve questions which are objectively highly complex and confusing and touch upon a multiplicity of contradictory interests. In particular, it is hard to ensure reliable effectiveness of verification. The Soviet Union, for its part, accepted the principle of mandatory inspections carried out on demand by a country suspecting that a violation of the treaty may have occurred. At the same time, one cannot rule out the possibility of this right's being abused for purely intelligence-gathering purposes. In this context, it is suggested that a special representative committee with a more or less broad membership be set up to decide upon the expediency of inspection.

The second difficulty is due to the fact that in principle, the production of chemical weapons involves no special technical complexities. This is why the convention ought to provide for a regime of international observers. Everybody agrees that progress in this direction is necessary, but this is a far from simple matter affecting the interests of all countries with a chemical industry.

Yu.K. Nazarkin described in detail the confusing labyrinth of specific, often exclusively technical, but important problems which must be solved before a convention banning chemical weapons is concluded. And what about the remaining items on the agenda? Their discussion has progressed considerably less than might have been expected. The conference's creative potential is far from fully utilized.

Much mud has stuck to the wheels of the disarmament cause. But a possibility of changes for the better is gradually emerging, becoming increasingly distinct and clear.

Bogachev Denounces INF 'Compensation' Plans

LD221718 Moscow TASS in English 1631 GMT 22 Feb 88

["'Compensation' Plans Are a Threat to Stability and Peace"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow February 22 TASS—TASS News Military Analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

In the United States, the overt opponents of the Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty act under the banner of maintaining the 'vitality' of the concept of a limited nuclear war in Europe. They work against ratification of the treaty, maintaining that its 'principal flaw' is the elimination of U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles capable of reaching important targets in the territories of socialist countries within 8-12 minutes and making it possible to wage a nuclear war at a great distance from American shores.

The overt and covert opponents of the treaty in the United States and Western Europe are brought together by their adherence to the idea of 'compensation' for the

U.S. nuclear missiles being eliminated under the treaty by other, no less dangerous but more numerous nuclear systems of NATO. Actually speaking, the 'compensation' idea is the litmus paper which makes it possible to determine the true attitude of political and military figures of the West to the INF Treaty accurately enough.

U.S. Secretary of Defence Frank Carlucci, who supports the INF Treaty by virtue of his official status, solidarises [as received] with U.S. General Bernard Ridgeway, an opponent of the treaty, when the talk turns to the modernisation of nuclear systems in Western Europe.

Both Carlucci, Ridgeway, and the now supreme allied Commander in Europe, U.S. General John Galvin, press for the deployment of new U.S. sea- and air-launched cruise missiles capable of reaching the territory of the USSR. In so doing they cynically argue that the INF Treaty does not cover air- and sea-launched cruise missiles.

The London newspaper THE OBSERVER points out that under 'compensation' plans, twice as many nuclear warheads as are subject to elimination under the INF Treaty should be deployed in Western Europe.

By drawing aside one pistol from Europe's temple, the 'compensation' advocates intend immediately to put another one against Europe's heart. What is then the meaning of disarmament under such scenarios?

Following the suicidal logic, the U.S. advocates of a 'limited nuclear war' in Europe are actively supported by some official spokesmen of NATO countries.

Margaret Thatcher announced her readiness to deply an additional amount of U.S. F-111 bombers on British territory by way of 'compensation'.

Setting out the basic provisions of his election programme which is designated 'a decade of renewal', Prime Minister Jacques Chirac of France has stated the need to prevent the establishment of a nuclear-free Europe. Both political figures state that Britain and France by no means intend to stop the nuclear arms build-up.

An active consolidation of militarist forces, which come out against lowering the level of military confrontation in Europe and throughout the world, is under way in NATO countries. Approaching to a solution to the problems of the future with the yardsticks and thinking of yesterday is characteristic of all of them. This approach may lead to the emergence of a serious threat to the security of the whole of mankind.

Security Concerns of On-Site Inspections Noted

PM191145 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 16 Feb 88 p 3

[Article by International Observer G. Dadyants under the rubric "Dialogue With a Reader": "Why On-Site Inspection is Necessary"; first paragraph is SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA introduction]

[Text] Not all our people can understand why we are, for instance, reducing more missiles than the Americans under the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. This was frankly discussed at a joint session of the USSR Supreme Soviet foreign affairs commissions. There are also several other questions connected with this treaty. A reader from Glazov City, who signs himself Kr-v is among the doubters. Our international observer G. Dadyants answers the questions put by him in his latest dialogue with a reader on topical problems of international politics.

[Reader] The treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles was signed in Washington quite recently. In connection with the signing of this treaty I have several questions. How could it happen that U.S. observers have gained access to plants in Votkinsk and Sverdlovsk? Is the presence of foreigners in the Urals justified and does this not present a threat to our security, for the Urals are the center of our industry?

[Dadyants] Yes, only a few years ago it was hard to imagine such a decision. We viewed demands for on-site verification as an attempt to legalize intelligence activity on our country's territory. Such was the logic of confrontation, the logic of the old political thinking. The West did not want to really disarm and it was trying to impose verification without disarmament on us. But a feature of the treaty concluded in Washington is that it unites real disarmament and verification. Under the conditions of the distrust which still exists, disarmament without verification is impossible. "In matters concerning the state's security," USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze stressed when he addressed the joint session of the USSR Supreme Soviet foreign affairs commissions, "there should be no ambiguity in questions of the treaty's observance. That is why we made special efforts to equip the treaty with a carefully elaborated verification system of the maximum reliability unprecedented in the practice of international relations."

An echeloned package of inspections is envisaged which, combined with national technical means of verification, enable both sides to be certain of the reliability of the treaty's observance. This package will also include continuous inspections of the nonproduction of missiles at the portal of the manufacturing plant. Let us note that the plants in Votkinsk and Sverdlovsk are subject to various forms of inspection under the treaty. The plants in Sverdlovsk, Volgograd, and Petropavlovsk, like the plants in Middle River and San Diego in the United

States, are subject to quota inspections on a periodical basis, while the plants in Votkinsk and Magna (Utah) are subject to continuous observation.

Does the presence of foreigners at Soviet plants not threaten our security? No more than the presence of our inspectors at U.S. military plants threatens U.S. security.

It was on questions of verification that a breakthrough to the new thinking was accomplished in concluding the treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles. Old stereotypes and old ideas of security are being broken. Strict verification of the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles is evidence of how far the sides have gone to meet each other to achieve real disarmament.

[Reader] How will verification be implemented, and by whom? Observers will probably be at the portals or will have special places inside shops. Or will verification be implemented in the form of commissions visiting plants at a specified time?

[Dadyants] The treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and the protocols to it explain everything on this score with the utmost clarity. As we have already said, there are several types of inspection. Thus, for instance, inspections to verify initial data begin 30 days and end 90 days after the entry into force of the treaty. Inspections to confirm the elimination of missile operating bases and support facilities are to be carried out over the course of 3 years after the entry into force of the treaty. Inspections on a quota basis are to be carried out within 13 years of the entry into force of the treaty. During the first 3 years, each side has the right to carry out up to 20 such inspections a year, and 15 and 10 inspections in the next 5 years and last 5 years respectively. Inspections are carried out not only in the USSR and the United States but also in countries where intermediate- and shorter-range missiles have been or were to have been sited—the GDR, Czechoslovakia, Britain, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands. The USSR has the right to conduct up to 240 such inspections and the United States up to 400 such inspections over the 13 years.

Permanent posts for inspectors at plants in Votkinsk and Magna are being installed around the plant perimeters. Output is being shipped out through only three exit points, where it is subject to control. The inspectors can open any containers with missiles, take measurements, weigh output, and even use x-ray apparatus to convince themselves that it is not a case of an item banned by the treaty.

All requests for inspections on the basis of suspicion are made through the centers which are being created to reduce the nuclear danger. A reply is given within an hour. The group of inspectors arrives at the point of entry (In the USSR that means Moscow and Irkutsk, in the United States, Washington and San Francisco) within 16 hours. The inspection site is indicated at least 4 hours and no more than 24 hours after the inspectors' arrival at the point of entry. They arrive on their own aircraft and the inspected side then provides them with transport and everything they need. The duration of a single inspection is no more than 24 hours, but it can be extended by agreement by both sides. Those are the procedures elaborated for quota inspections.

[Reader] Will U.S. observers be allowed to tour the city and go to other places and population centers? Are they allowed to meet with citizens of our country?

[Dadyants] The U.S. inspectors will enjoy privileges and immunity, as will our inspectors in the United States or countries which are U.S. allies. I do not believe that inspectors visiting our country for 24 hours for a specific purpose—carrying out an inspection—will have time for hunting or fishing. As for the inspectors who will be working on a permanent basis, they probably cannot be restricted to one portal at the plant—they must live somewhere, they must eat, and live under the same or similar conditions to those under which diplomats work in their host country.

[Reader] What kind of monitoring of U.S. observers will there be, and how will it be carried out?

[Dadyants] I believe that it would be wrong and counter to the spirit of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles to see a spy in every U.S. inspector working in our country or visiting it briefly. Probably the usual procedure established by each country's legislation for people enjoying diplomatic immunity will extend to U.S. inspectors and to our inspectors in the United States.

We realize that the letter by Comrade Kr-v from Glazov is dictated by concern for our country's security. But I should like to note in conclusion that the concept of "security" is being substantially transformed in our time. Security is now ensured not only by military means but also by political ones. More glasnost, goodwill, and mutual trust is required for that. Under the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, we will go no further than the other side. Elimination and verification are linked so strictly because both we and the Americans must be convinced that the treaty is being fulfilled honestly.

The principle of equal security by which we are guided in our policy presupposes not only national security but also security for all. The security of each state in the nuclear age becomes an element of universal security and of the advance to a nuclear-free and demilitarized world.

Galvin Remarks Cause 'Confusion, Alarm' in FRG

PM170821 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 88 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Yakhontov dispatch: "In a Predecessor's Footsteps"]

[Text] Bonn, 15 Feb—A Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG interview with U.S. General J. Galvin, NATO supreme allied commander in Europe, has provoked confusion and alarm among the West German public. It transpires that the general, who replaced the notorious B. Rogers in this post, is no different from his predecessor as regards his views on disarmament problems and also his strategic opinions.

Thus, Galvin stated that he opposes the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from Europe. "Yes, I am frightened of the denuclearization of Europe. I think that this trend will lead to a reduction in theater nuclear capability. And so in this respect I am worried, even very worried," the bloc's commander in chief says.

The general supports the modernization of all categories of nuclear weapons and also of conventional arms. Furthermore, he admits that modernization is already being implemented. In particular, nuclear shells for artillery systems are being improved. J. Galvin believes that NATO will continue to need "chemical deterrence" systems until such time as an agreement is secured on a total verifiable ban on this category of weapons. "For my part," he stated, "I advocate that chemical weapons (in the case in question it is a question of binary weapons—Yu. Ya.) be sited in Europe."

This pronouncement by the general, which is at complete variance with the decision of the FRG Government and the accord between Chancellor H. Kohl and President R. Reagan concerning the nondeployment of binary weapons in peacetime on the country's territory, has provoked sharp criticism, in particular from H. Ehmke, deputy chairman of the Social Democratic Party group in the Bundestag.

Socialist Countries Discuss Nuclear Exports

LD191706 Moscow TASS in English 1623 GMT 19 Feb 88

[Text] Warsaw February 19 TASS—A meeting of the group of the socialist countries—parties to the international agreements on nuclear export control was held here from February 16 to 18.

The constructive exchange of views covered a broad range of problems concerning a strengthening of the regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and IAEA's activities in that field. The participants in the meeting devoted special attention to the package of questions in connection with toughening control of the export of nuclear materials, equipment and technology.

The participants in the meeting also noted that the signing of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, whose preamble contains a reference to the commitment of the parties to the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to nuclear disarmament, opens new additional opportunities for a further strengthening of the treaty on non-proliferation, increasing the number of its participants and strengthens the international regime on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. In that connection the need was stressed for further advancement on the path towards nuclear disarmament, a drastic cut in the strategic offensive weapons, reaching agreements on the limitation and prohibition of nuclear weapons tests.

In the course of the meeting the importance was noted of creating peace zones free from nuclear weapons in various regions of the world.

The participants in the meeting reaffirmed their commitment to the aims and principles of the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as the most representative international agreement in the field of limitation of arms.

The meeting declared for a further development of broad international cooperation in the safe uses of atomic energy with peaceful aims, for the benefit of humanity's economic and social development. It was stressed that the principles of non-proliferation do not prevent the implementation of the national programmes for peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The participants in the meeting declared for an all-round strengthening of the IAEA as the leading international agency for cooperation for the solely peaceful use of nuclear energy, pointed to the importance of a further perfection of the agency's system of safeguards.

Pact Foreign Ministers Meet in Prague

Shevardnadze Leaves for Meeting

LD231036 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Comrade Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR foreign minister, left Moscow today for Prague to take part in a meeting of the Warsaw Pact member states' foreign ministers. He was seen off at the airport by Comrade Vorontsov, first deputy USSR foreign minister, and by other officials. Among those there to see him off was Rehorek, CSSR ambassador to the USSR.

Shevardnadze Arrives

LD231053 Moscow TASS in English 1037 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Prague February 23 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and Foreign Minister of the USSR, arrived here today for a meeting of the foreign ministers of the Warsaw Treaty nations. He was welcomed at the airport by Bohuslav Chnoupek, a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and foreign minister of Czechoslovakia, and other officials.

Participants Listed

LD231448 Moscow TASS in English 1431 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Prague February 23 TASS—A meeting of the foreign ministers of the Warsaw Treaty member-states opened here today. It is attended by member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, foreign minister of the People's Republic of Bulgaria Petur Mladenov, secretary of state of the Foreign Ministry of the Hungarian People's Republic Gyula Horn, secretary of state of the Foreign Ministry of the GDR Herbert Krolikowski, deputy foreign minister of the Polish People's Republic Henryk Jaroszek, candidate member of the Political Executive Committee of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party, foreign minister of the Socialist Republic of Romania Ioan Totu, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, foreign minister of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, foreign minister of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic Bohuslav Chnoupek.

Vienna NATO-Pact Disarmament Talks Continue

Kashlev Cited on Future Talks

LD200024 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 19 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Consultations between representatives of the 23 countries that are members of the Warsaw Pact or NATO to draw up a brief for new talks on reducing armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals are continuing in Vienna.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent V.Mikheyev, identified by caption] There is a detailed discussion of the aims and subject matter of the talks: the verification zone and measures. Some elements in the brief have been agreed in advance, specifically strengthening the stability of security in Europe by reducing the level of armed forces and conventional weapons. There is also agreement that after the conclusion of the all-European meeting, these new talks could begin as early as this year.

[Yu.B. Kashlev, the head of the Soviet delegation, identified by caption] Attention is now focusing on the key element in the brief for the future talks; namely, the question of which types of weapons will be subject to reductions and other measures to be agreed. From the outset the socialist countries have said that within the conventional weapons complex, consideration should also be given to their most destabilizing and dangerous component, the so-called dual-purpose weapons; that is, specifically, a question of tactical strike aircraft, tactical missiles, and heavy artillery. Since our Western counterparts are not, at the moment, ready to discuss the question of reducing tactical nuclear weapons, we would, as Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze said recently in Bonn, be prepared to examine the question of dual-purpose weapons without their nuclear component, and to examine the latter subsequently at appropriate separate talks. We are now awaiting a reply from the NATO countries to that proposal, and we will accordingly judge the seriousness of their intentions regarding the reduction of armed forces and weapons in Europe, which is a long overdue task. [end recording]

Czech Delegation Proposal

LD221044 Moscow TASS in English 1037 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] Vienna February 22 TASS—A regular meeting within the framework of consultations between member countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO on working out a mandate of talks on reducing armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals was held in Vienna today.

The Czechoslovak delegation put forward on behalf of the Warsaw Treaty nations a proposal on principles for the future talks.

Under this proposal, the talks would be held on the basis of equal rights, balance and reciprocity, and equal respect for security interests of all participating countries.

The proposal rules out the possibility of circumventing arrangements reached at the talks by compensatory measures or any other actions contradicting the objectives of the talks.

The Warsaw Treaty delegates also proposed that the reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments be accompanied by corresponding cuts in military spending.

Mediterranean Security Viewed

LD221553 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] Vienna February 22 TASS—TASS correspondent Igor Revyakin reports:

Problems of the Mediterranean region have lately been riveting the attention of various political forces, broad public circles, and there are weighty reasons for that.

The signing of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of the Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles has created realistic prerequisites for lessening of tension also in the Mediterranean area. But certain circles in the West are calling for INF "compensation" with modernisation and buildup of both conventional armaments, of high precision to that, approaching by their demolishing effect to weapons of mass destruction, and tactical nuclear weapons. [sentence as received] The Supreme NATO Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command, General John Galvin overtly said that the United States should create a new short-range nuclear arsenal for Europe to restore the NATO fire power which will be lost under the INF Treaty. The NATO circles are planning, specifically, to equip U.S. warships with long-range sea-based cruise missiles. Such intentions make more topical the problem of consolidating stability in the flanks of Europe, including in the Mediterranean.

The Mediterranean has for many years been an arena of armed clashes, unending conflicts, a source of destabilisation of the international situation. The nuclear confrontation level in the region is also high.

The Soviet Union earlier put forward the proposal that the region should become a zone of stable peace, good-neighbourliness and cooperation, an area covered by the measures of confidence and security. The USSR proposed to withdraw from the Mediterranean Sea on a mutual basis nuclear-capable ships of the USSR and the USA, to agree on non-deployment of nuclear weapons on the territory of Mediterranean non-nuclear countries and adoption by the nuclear powers of the obligation not to use such weapons against any Mediterranean country which does not allow deployment of nuclear weapons on its territory. The Soviet Union is known to have expressed readiness to go still further—to see the navies of the USSR and the USA withdrawn from the Mediterranean altogether. Consideration of the questions of security and cooperation in Mediterranean at the Vienna meeting of representatives of the states, parties to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe has not so far led to real results, though a whole number of ideas which were put forward, including by neutral and non-aligned countries, on questions of security and development of cooperation in the region create a solid basis for an advance foward. But the delegations of the NATO countries are seeking to limit Vienna accords on the Mediterranean mainly to measures of environmental protection which is unacceptable to a whole number of countries. Protection of ecological systems of the given region is undoubtedly an important matter but not the only one which calls for energetic efforts on the part of all participating states. The time has long come for holding a conference of the states, participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, on the Mediterranean, as Malta, Cyprus and Yugoslavia propose.

"The Vienna meeting", the TASS correspondent has been told by the head of the USSR delegation Ambassador Yuriy Kashlev, "can and should make a weighty contribution to normalisation of the situation in the Mediterranean, to make it, now a seat of unending conflicts and tension, a zone of peace, goodneighbourliness and cooperation. The states, participants in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, can play a major role in that. All of them should only display political will and the readiness to follow the intention, expressed in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, to make a contribution to consolidation of peace, security and justice in that area, which would be in common interests of all Mediterranean states. As was noted in the Soviet Government's recent reply to the message of the Non-aligned Mediterranean states, "The Soviet Union is ready to deepen the dialogue and cooperation with the Non-aligned Mediterranean states with a view of reducing tension, turning the Mediterranean into a zone of stable peace, goodneighbourliness and cooperation."

The Soviet delegation to the Vienna meeting is ready for the quest for generally acceptable accords in the whole package of pressing Mediterranean problems, Yuriy Kashlev said.

NATO Military 'Compensation' Idea Denounced

PM231051 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Feb 88 Second Edition p 5

[Own observer Aleksandr Golts "Military-Political Review": "A Noble Mission, a Lofty Vocation"]

[Text] Today is the eve of a holiday. Quite naturally, this has determined the cheerful tone of most of the materials featured on the pages of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. I regret, therefore, that it is my lot to write about problems and events which are not likely to induce a cheerful mood. However, without this, the discussion about the role of our Armed Forces would not be complete. One must not fail to mention the military-political situation in which they, shoulder to shoulder with the armies of the allied states, discharge their historic mission in the defense of the gains of socialism.

Unquestionably, positive changes are currently taking place in the world arena. "...The new political thinking," M.S. Gorbachev stressed in his speech at the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum, "is not only conquering people's minds; it has begun to influence the course of world politics." The most important specific result is the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. This treaty has met with widespread approval in all continents.

However, the fact that it inspires peoples with hope has evoked a panic fear in some people. The events of the most recent past indicate that a process of the consolidation of reactionary militarist circles is in full swing, of circles which are trying to undermine the positive processes that have emerged in the sphere of disarmament and international security. Yes, the militarists are sounding the alarm; they are sounding assembly. They have already mounted an attack on the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The struggle around this treaty continues in the U.S. Senate.

In parallel, a sweeping disinformation campaign has been launched in the United States, the aim of which is to discredit the Soviet Union as a negotiating partner. For instance, rumors are being spread claiming that the USSR has 160 more SS-20 missiles than stated in the memorandum of understanding in connection with the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The USSR Defense Ministry has, on the basis of incontrovertible facts, officially rejected these fabrications. At the same time, it was pointed out that the production and launches of missiles subject to elimination continue in the United States. The Pentagon has only just tested six Pershing-2 missiles at one go at Cape Canaveral.

There has also been one attempt after another on the part of the West to emasculate the treaty, to reduce it to a replacement of one kind of nuclear means by another. After all, this is precisely the essence of the notorious "compensation" that NATO figures have been harping on for months. For instance, U.S. General J. Galvin, NATO Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, has declared bluntly: "The United States must create a new arsenal of short-range weapons for Europe to restore the NATO fire power which will be lost under the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles."

The British Prime Minister M. Thatcher is no less worried about this problem than the U.S. general. In order to discuss all the aspects of this "compensation," she specially visited the NATO headquarters in Brussels for the first time in her life. There she held talks with NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington and then addressed the permanent representatives of the alliance's member countries. In the course of the press conference that followed, the prime minister sharply attacked the idea of a nuclear-free Europe and extolled in every possible way the NATO strategy of "flexible response" which provides for the use of both nuclear and conventional arms in the event of an armed conflict.

However, if matters did not go beyond words, the situation would not be so serious. However, the NATO men are not just talking; they are acting as well. So, for instance, London officialdom has agreed to the deployment of a further 60 F-111 bombers in addition to the 150 U.S. nuclear bombers already stationed in this country. According to the press, the "compensation" is to involve not only air force but also naval weapons, and specifically, the deployment of an additional number of U.S. Tomahawk cruise missiles near the shores of the European Continent.

The NATO leaders, egged on by Washington, have clearly "forgotten" that they tried to justify the deployment of the U.S. "Euromissiles" by citing the need to create a "counterbalance" to the Soviet intermediate-range missiles. This problem has now been removed under the terms of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. So where are the "losses" that need to be "compensated" for?

In reply to this kind of question, the Atlanticists usually start holding forth about some kind of superiority of the Soviet Union in chemical and conventional weapons. But if this is indeed so in their opinion, why do they not focus their efforts on the complete elimination of the former and a reduction of the latter to a level of reasonable sufficiency, thus depriving the Soviet Union of its "superiority?" Especially since the Soviet Union itself has proposed that the elimination of imbalances and asymmetries should be attended to.

However, both in Washington and in other NATO capitals, people prefer other methods. Take chemical weapons, for instance. As is well known, talks about their complete elimination have been under way in Geneva for several years. Progress at these talks has been made possible thanks to the constructive approach of the Soviet Union, which has proposed solutions to the most complex questions mainly concerning verification procedures. However, as soon as a realistic opportunity arose of successfully completing the convention on a total ban of chemical weapons, Western states lost interest in it and started heaping up new obstacles. Furthermore, the United States has embarked on the production of a new generation of chemical weapons—binary weapons—and is now, contrary to its former promises, planning to deploy them in Europe.

The situation concerning conventional weapons is similar. Almost every day you can hear statements about the mythical Soviet superiority. Yet at the same time, Western countries are trying in every way to block the consultations in Vienna between representatives of NATO and the Warsaw Pact on the elaboration of a mandate for talks on conventional arms reduction.

Facts indicate that by no means do imaginary imbalances or real verification difficulties worry militarists. As in the past, what they are concerned about is preserving their illusory hopes of gaining military superiority over the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. This is why they need binary bombs and shells; this is why they need their plans for "compensation!"

This is happening not only in respect to the Continent of Europe. The Pentagon is consistently implementing a policy aimed at the intensification of militarist preparations in Asia and the Pacific region. As a result, Japan's military budget will increase by more than 5 percent. This country's military department is envisaging the use of cruise missiles and aircraft carriers as part of the arsenal. Neither has Washington given up its attempts to form bloc structures on the lines of NATO in Asia. One of the steps in this direction are the "Rimpac-88" maneuvers scheduled for June. American, Japanese, British, Canadian, New Zealand, and Australian naval forces are to take part in them.

U.S. claims to world supremacy have not subsided either. This is borne out by the U.S. military budget for fiscal 1989. Despite the widely advertised cuts, it has actually been "stretched" by $300 billion. According to this budget, the appropriation of funds is envisaged for the creation and deployment of precisely those types of strategic offensive arms—MX missiles, strategic bombers, and missile-carrying submarines—the reduction of which is being discussed at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva.

Clearly, some people in the United States are hoping that the confrontation will continue. The United States has only just demonstrated its readiness to engage in adventurist actions. I am referring to the crude provocation in Soviet territorial waters near the Crimean Peninsula. The factual side of this affair is well known. When the missile cruiser "Yorktown" and the destroyer "Caron" of the U.S. Navy intruded into Soviet territorial waters despite numerous warnings, our warships barred their way.

In my view, there are two aspects to the provocation organized by the United States. The first is political. It has become a kind of bad tradition that U.S.-Soviet high-level talks are preceded by a scandal, invariably of Washington's making. Hysteria is created on account of a mythical powder with which U.S. diplomats in Moscow are allegedly dusted, or an utterly banal amorous affair of a U.S. Embassy guard is presented as an "attempt to capture" U.S. secrets. Now, certain Washington figures, as if by order, have suddenly started saying that the events in the Black Sea have revived their "distrust" of the USSR. As if it had not been a question of U.S. ships near the Crimean shores but Soviet vessels in the vicinity of Florida! It must be assumed that such actions are part and parcel of U.S. preparations for talks—a strange approach, to say the least.

However, this provocation also has a military side. It seems to me that it is no accident that the U.S. admirals so brazenly defend their "right" to come close to Soviet shores. This cannot but be linked with the notorious new U.S. naval strategy which envisages strikes at enemy territory from the sea. One cannot omit to mention here also the "strategy of discriminate deterrence," which has only just been developed by the Pentagon experts and which claims that it is necessary to rebut "the threat on our adversaries' borders rather than the U.S. borders." Such a theory, combined with the practice of provocations, smacks of overt adventurism. A dangerous adventurism!

As we can see, very influential forces that are not in the least interested in peaceful coexistence are still trying to push mankind onto the fallacious path of confrontation, onto a path fraught with a nuclear catastrophe. These circumstance truly raise the responsibility of the Soviet Union and of world socialism for safeguarding peace by a whole order of magnitude. This responsibility also falls to a considerable degree on the Armed Forces, whose task it is to prevent war, both nuclear and conventional.

Naturally, the idea of "deterrence" being preached in the West is fundamentally alien to the defensive Soviet military doctrine. Proceeding from the principle of reasonable sufficiency, we are prepared to make every effort to lower the level of confrontation.

However, it is also absolutely obvious that limits of reasonable sufficiency are determined by the actions of the United States and NATO. This is why the CPSU Central Committee and the Central Committee Politburo are paying unremitting attention to the strengthening of our motherland's defense capability and the combat might of the Soviet Armed Forces, which have been and remain a powerful factor of peace and peoples' security.

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable'

LD220015 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1230 GMT 21 Feb 88

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Boris Andrianov, All-Union Radio foreign political commentator; Nikolay Ivanovich Agayants, foreign affairs journalist; and Vadim Borisovich Kassis, editor of the GOLOS RODINY newspaper and OTCHIZNA magazine]

[Text] [Andrianov] Good afternoon, comrades. Taking part in our roundtable meeting today are foreign affairs journalist Nikolay Ivanovich Agayants and Vadim Borisovich Kassis, editor of the newspaper GOLOS RODINY and the magazine OTCHIZNA.

The latest plenum of the Central Committee of our party was held this week. A big speech was delivered at the plenum by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He spoke about a variety of matters directly related to revolutionary restructuring in our country. But at the same time, Comrade Gorbachev also touched on certain international aspects of the ideology of restructuring.

On the Soviet-U.S. treaty signed on 8 December last year, the Soviet leader noted that this document is an indicator of the level that the potential for peace has attained. It also shows that the new thinking is not just winning minds but has already begun to influence world politics. Yet Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev emphasized that the signing of the treaty is not an excuse for complacency: It does not mean we can now sit back and relax. It can be said to have begun another stage of the struggle for disarmament and peace, which is, in part, an ideological struggle.

Another of the central events of the week now ending was the visit to the USSR of Geoffrey Howe, the British secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs. His meetings on 16 February with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and his talks with Comrade Shevardnadze are today being widely discussed and commented on in the foreign media, as is only natural, for this visit is being seen in the context of the continuing East-West dialogue, in which regular Soviet-British contacts occupy an important place. In particular, they have already played a part—and could play a still larger part—in the general European and international process.

[Kassis] But as the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee remarked at his meeting with Geoffrey Howe—and the British foreign minister agreed with him—it is important that each time they take place, these contacts should carry us forward, that this important dialogue should not be emasculated, that it should not be swamped with phrases that do not lead to anything concrete and practical. That danger does, unfortunately, exist—and not through any fault of ours.

[Agayants] Yes, indeed, the Soviet Union, guided by the new thinking and new approaches, is pursuing an open international policy aimed at solving the problems of our time. We are especially sensitive to European tones of voice. We act in such a way as always to be correctly understood. That is why we expect our partners, including Britain, to deal with us in a way that will make their logic, the meaning of their actions, clear to us. Otherwise, it is difficult to achieve complete trust. Why are we saying this? Because we discern in the policy of the

Western powers, Britain among them, elements of inconsistency, attempts to revise, to some extent, the accords that have been achieved—an odd kind of maneuvering. This puts us on our guard, especially at a time when we are beginning to see the first light at the end of the tunnel as regards progress on disarmament.

[Kassis] One thing Sir Geoffrey Howe said is that for the foreseeable future, Britain will continue to need a minimum potential of deterrence. Such is his standpoint, quite unoriginal and far from new. It shows once again that the stereotypes of the past are still very much alive; they provide an argument for certain people in the West to clutch at.

[Andrianov] A propos of this, I think we should recall what Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said during his meeting with Geoffrey Howe: that Western politicians have very firmly entrenched in their minds the image of an enemy whose only thought is to find some victim to attack. It is time to put an end to the fears that arose in the period of the cold war, said Comrade Gorbachev; otherwise, the wheels of the process of building our European home and normalizing international relations as a whole will spin without moving forward.

[Agayants] You know, the situation we are getting into is this: The leaders of the countries of NATO, Britain included, in general approve of the intermediate- and shorter-range missile treaty. Yet they are now behaving as if the situation in Europe had suddenly deteriorated since it was signed. They have started to talk about the need for some kind of compensation for the nuclear missiles being eliminated; they call for a strengthening of the military cohesion of the NATO countries, and think up all sorts of projects for joint production of the latest weapons, and so forth.

[Andrianov] During the talks in Moscow, Geoffrey Howe's attention was drawn to the dangerous nature of these plans, which are fraught with a new round of the arms race and a destabilization of the situation. It was stressed that at the present time, it is of the utmost importance to make the process of disarmament continuous and irreversible, and not to allow any pause between the agreements achieved in this sphere and those that lie in the future. Regarding possible steps in the sphere of disarmament, the Soviet and British foreign ministers noted that the priorities of the two sides in foreign policy largely coincide.

[Kassis] Indeed, Boris Vasilyevich. That applies to the 50 percent reduction of the strategic offensive armaments of the Soviet Union and the United States, with observance of the ABM Treaty during an agreed period in the form in which it was signed in 1972. It also applies to the elimination of chemical weapons and, finally, to the reduction of conventional weapons and armed forces in Europe.

[Agayants] That's right. Comrade Shevardnadze and Howe confirmed this in the areas you've enumerated, Vadim Borisovich. But in the pages of Western newspapers and magazines and on radio and television, they've again started talking about the USSR having some huge advantage in conventional weapons and in armed forces. Getting down to brass tacks, it should certainly be noted that, say, Britain's attitude to the question of eliminating chemical weapons and banning their production and stockpiling has recently undergone a very unfavorable transformation. As Mikhail Sergeyevich told Geoffrey Howe, Britain has become noticeably cooler toward concluding a convention to ban chemical weapons. On the issue of reducing conventional arms and armed forces, in the otherwise acceptable formula—make haste slowly—Britain is putting emphasis on the last part.

[Andrianov] Moreover, Nikolay Ivanovich, voices are now being heard in London urging that the United States should be permitted to deploy components of binary weapons in Britain. Those who are advocating this dangerous step claim it would make it easier for talks on eliminating chemical weapons to begin as soon as possible—just as NATO's "double-zero option" is supposed to have helped us to achieve our agreement to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons—which is also, to put it bluntly, a pretty threadbare argument.

[Kassis] Today the world quite obviously needs a policy adequate to the times we live in; that is what we expect, especially in dealing with a country of the political magnitude and international stature of Britain.

[Agayants] During an exchange of views on ways of settling regional conflicts, it was noted at the Soviet-British talks that there was a common understanding to the effect that the quest for solutions to these difficult problems ought to be conducted collectively, by political means. Experience of interaction in the UN Security Council on the Iran-Iraq conflict speaks in favor of this, as does the growing support in the world for the idea of convening an international conference on the Near East.

[Andrianov] We should remind ourselves at this point that Comrade Shevardnadze and Geoffrey Howe had a frank and direct conversation about the state of affairs in Afghanistan—about the fact that the deepening process of national reconciliation in that country, progress at the Afghan-Pakistan talks in Geneva, and the announcement by the Soviet Union of a specific timetable for the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan have created all the necessary conditions for signing agreements on a settlement in the very near future. The important things is that all sides should show the maximum of goodwill and responsibility.

[Kassis] Yes, well, it's a fact to be noted that throughout the last week the media have been commenting, from various standpoints and on the basis of preconceived ideas, on the statement on Afghanistan by Mikhail Sergeyvich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU

Central Committee. They have also not neglected the appearance on national television of President Najibullah. In principle, it might seem that everything is clear and straightforward: The leaders of the friendly neighboring states publicly set out the positions of their governments. The purpose of this double action is equally clear: to promote the achievement of a political settlement of the military conflict in Afghanistan. But in life, not everything is so cloudlessly simple and self-evident. Some observers have simply brushed aside the only correct and rational axiom and have set about interpreting everything, as before, by standing it on its head.

[Agayants] What is most surprising is that they have been making a point of doing so with such frenzied haste, not stopping to think that any political act or statement is assessed, above all, from the point of view of its specific content: how close it is to the realities of the day and what benefits it can bring to nations.

[Andrianov] That is not all. There are even some politicians who are trying to represent this peace-loving Soviet action—dictated exclusively by goodwill and based on a realistic analysis of the full complexity of the problem in all of its stages—as some sort of concession to the hard line taken by the West. It is an old trick, and one that has long been favored by the bourgeois ideologists. However, as a rule, it has suffered inevitable failure in the eyes of world public opinion.

[Kassis] But let us look first of all at Afghanistan and listen to what they think the Afghans themselves are saying. So, let us turn to a man well known in that country, Muhammad Hasan Sharq, who is vice chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Committee for Returnees Affairs. He believes that a very important element in Comrade Gorbachev's statement is that he has given a date, a specific date, when the withdrawal of Soviet troops will begin—15 May 1988—and indicated the 10-month period over which the withdrawal is to be completed. Note the biography of Muhammad Hasan Sharq: He was one of the closest associates of Daud, who for a number of years was prime minister in the country's royal government. For some 10 years, Sharq headed his personal chancellery. After King Zahir Shah was deposed in 1973, Dr Sharq was deputy prime minister for 3 years, the offices of president and prime minister being occupied, after the coup and up to the April Revolution, by Daud. As for Dr Sharq, he did not return to active political life until after the national reconciliation policy had been proclaimed in Afghanistan.

[Agayants] Here, then, you can say we are dealing with an exceptional man, a thinking man with a grasp of the situation; therefore, you would like to hear about his ideas in a more extensive context.

[Andrianov] Yes, Nikolay Ivanovich, I was just about to say some more about Dr Sharq. He feels, for example, that the difficult situation in his country is one of the worst and most painful to have resulted from a regional conflict anywhere in the world. As a positive element, he notes that at the indirect Afghan-Pakistani talks in Geneva, which are taking place through the mediation of the personal representative of the UN Secretary General Cordovez, work has almost been completed on documents that cover all aspects of a settlement. One would like, says Dr Sharq, to believe Cordovez, who sees the next round of talks in Geneva as the grand finale.

[Agayants] You can see the paradoxes that are already becoming apparent. Among the documents prepared in Geneva is an Afghan-Pakistani agreement on noninterference in each other's internal affairs and the return of Afghan refugees from Pakistan. Everything seemed to be going fine. Then, suddenly... Let us refer to a commentary in the Indian newspaper PATRIOT: Just recently, the paper writes, Pakistani President Ziaul Haq said in a WASHINGTON POST interview that he will not sign any agreement with the Afghan Government. The political observer Chopra goes on to conclude thta Ziaul Haq's stance is close to that of such rebel leaders as Yunis Khalis and Golboddin Hekmatyra, who refuse to negotiate even with UN mediator Cordovez.

[Andrianov] Well, there it is: The interests of Pakistan's very highly militarized politico-economic structure coincide completely with the interests of the hawks in the United States. The president and all the military top brass in Islamabad realize that if the Afghan problem is solved by negotiation, their role in Washington's long-term strategy will be reduced to nothing, that they would immediately lose their fat dividends from the unlimited traffic in arms.

[Agayants] Now I think we must turn to the problem of setting up a coalition government in Afghanistan—about which, incidentally, a great deal is now being said and written.

[Kassis] Yes, it is a question that merits the closest attention. That process itself is not taking place without collisions or cost, though a certain amount has been done in a positive way, with understanding of the true situation and disposition of forces. For instance, two representatives of the left-wing democratic grouping ROTA [Revolutionary Organization of Toilers of Afghanistan] have been included in the cabinet, and its leader, Kushani, has been appointed a vice chairman of the Republic's Council of Ministers. The representatives of the Islamic opposition are not being excluded from the process of forming a coalition government either. We have already read of the presidential decree granting amnesty to a number of leaders of large formations of the Islamic opposition who were sentenced to death in the summer of 1986 for their armed struggle against the Afghan people. While under investigation, by the way, these people justified their participation and even leadership in the fratricidal war by the presence of the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan. What can any of their like say now that very soon, according to the time-scale stipulated in Comrade Gorbachev's statement, the Soviet soldiers will be leaving the country?

[Agayants] Let me add that however difficult it may be to solve, the question of setting up a coalition government in Afghanistan is above all purely an internal matter for Afghanistan. It has to be solved by the Afghans themselves, regardless of the fact that some of them belong to one camp and others to another. Unfortunately, there still are, among the opposition, some who are so vehemently against settling the problem that they will not even hear of anything sensible. They answer everything with a categorical refusal, failing to offer any sort of constructive initiative of their own. We must look the truth in the eye, however painful that may be. After all, what the leaders of the Afghan rebels want most of all is to retain, by whatever means, the possibility of continuing their bloodbath in Afghanistan after the limited contingent of Soviet troops has gone. They are getting money from their protectors to fight against their own people.

[Kassis] I suggest that Washington knows the situation better than anyone. It is no accident that the White House representative simply evaded the question as to when the United States will stop military aid to the rebels, saying that a lot will depend on the talks in Geneva.

[Agayants] Yes, now that the way to settlement is open, the Washington proponents of a hard line are trying to put up new barriers and to get out of a direct answer to the question of stopping U.S. military aid to the Afghan rebels.

[Kassis] It is that aid alone that the so-called Alliance of Seven is counting on, an alliance that includes the seven leaders of the Afghan counterrevolutionary groups.

[Agayants] Each one of this, if you will allow me to say, magnificent seven has boundless ambition. Anything goes except the struggle for the noble idea of national reconciliation. As many soberly rational observers rightly note, all claims to power by the heads of the rebel groups will ultimately lead to internal feuding and to their simply fighting amongst themselves.

[Andrianov] Well, maybe, but that is their affair. Here it is essential to say honestly that the revival of the political wing of the Afghan rebel groups will undoubtedly have a negative effect on the process of settling the Afghan issue. After all, the situation for a settlement has never developed so successfully before. The Soviet statement has provided a unique opportunity for this. However, we must keep in mind that the forces seeking to undermine it are playing their dangerous game as before and are not going to stop at anything. The months ahead will clearly demonstrate the true position of all those taking part in a political settlement of the Afghanistan situation.

[Agayants] I would like to add something briefly to what has been said on the various aspects of the Afghan problem, and not in my own words. I am going to quote an article published this week in THE WASHINGTON POST. It was written by Lou Cannon, who has come to the conclusion that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement on withdrawing Soviet troops from Afghanistan came as a great surprise to the White House. Representatives of the Washington administration reacted with such caution to the Soviet leader's statement, says Lou Cannon, that they gave the impression that they were not prepared for it. Washington's incomprehensible response to the statement on troop withdrawal, the author of the article goes on to stress, gives the impression that the White House is practically disappointed that Reagan is being deprived of the Afghan problem.

[Andrianov] I suppose you cannot help agreeing with the conclusion of the author of the article. After all, in recent years the White House has exploited 100 percent, as they say, the situation around Afghanistan for its own, to be precise, mercenary ends. The Afghan issue has done service as a sort of broomstick that the U.S. Administration has been stubbornly trying to thrust into the wheel of settling any international problem if it was the Soviet Union that proposed solving it. Take the problem of turning the Indian Ocean into a peace zone. Washington has persistently linked this to the Afghan issue, asserting that, as they say, Soviet troops should be withdrawn from Afghanistan first, and only then should an international conference be convened on the Indian Ocean. Incidentally, a week dedicated to the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf countries, held at the initiative of the World Peace Council under the banner of strong action to eliminate a foreign military basis in the region, end the arms race there, and turn the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace and international cooperation, is now coming to an end.

[Agayants] Yes, the Indian problem really is one of the most important international problems. Attention in the Asian countries and indeed the world as a whole is now turned to this area of the world's ocean and in particular to the northwestern part, where a dangerous center of tension has developed. Explosions can be heard there, people are dying, and there is extensive material damage. NATO has operating there a group of warships unprecedented in peacetime, which has been assembled in the Persian Gulf region. The core of this armada, and a powerful one at that, is made up of U.S. ships. There are 24 of these there at the moment.

[Kassis] Yes, that is so, but a few days ago the Pentagon announced that a regrouping of the U.S. naval forces operating in the Persian Gulf area is beginning. Fourteen ships will leave, and 11 others should arrive to take their place. There will thus be three units less. With this gesture, Washington is evidently intent on demonstrating that it is seeing to the business of cutting down the numbers in its squadron in the Persian Gulf. Such a step should, they say, display a kind of moderation in the aspiration of the United States in one of the hot spots on our planet.

[Agayants] On the point of moderation, that is debatable. A reduction in the number of warships by no means signifies an actual decrease in the fighting capacity of the entire grouping.

[Andrianov] It is not, however, just a question of that. Assistant U.S. Secretary of Defense Armitage announced that the changes in the makeup of the naval grouping does not in any way signify a change in United States' policy. Elucidating this idea, he noted that the United States has always said that its policy consists of having the armed forces needed for carrying out the tasks at hand. Just like that, quite openly, speaking quite plainly, the Pentagon's representatives set forth the purposefulness of the course being pursued by the Washington administration in the Persian Gulf, which wholly and fully reflects the aims of the United States throughout the entire zone of the Indian Ocean.

[Agayants] Well, Boris Vasiliyevich, it would be more correct to say in all expanses of water throughout the world, including the Indian Ocean. It is not for nothing that President Reagan does not tire of repeating that superiority on the seas is a necessity for the United States. The head of the White House demands that such superiority should invariably be possessed by Washington alone. This directive is reflected in the general trend in the militaristic policy of the United States in the Indian Ocean as well. It is set forth in the cynical revelation of the former Pentagon chief, Weinberger. Expressing the point of view of the White House, he announced for all to hear that the Indian Ocean is a region where the terms parity or equality are unacceptable to the United States. We, Weinberger stressed, should have naval superiority there.

[Adrianov] Why are they striving for such superiority? For what purposes are they straining after it? It is no secret that the United States has declared regions of the Indian Ocean, including the Near East and Southeast Asia, the third major strategic zone of military confrontation with the Soviet Union. The first two zones of this type they name are Western Europe and the Far East. Persistently pursuing a policy of militarization of the Indian Ocean, Washington's strategists are attempting to create a direct threat to the Soviet Union. From the southern frontiers of our country, it is not all that far to the shores of that water basin, you see. Along its perimeters, the Pentagon already has 30 bases and strong points. But in addition to this, it is seeking new military facilities on the territories of the littoral states. The waters of the ocean are being plied by U.S. naval squadrons, and the air space above it is ploughed by American bombers. At the military bases, moreover, on board ships and aircraft there are nuclear weapons. That is, the Indian Ocean is in fact turned into a forward basing zone for the U.S. strategic forces. They represent a real threat to the security of the independent, nonaligned countries that are situated in that region as well.

[Kassis] The situation that has taken shape has long been causing concern among the international community. You see, it is not accidental either that in 1971 the UN General Assembly adopted a declaration on the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. A year later it created a special committee on the Indian Ocean. Fourteen years ago, it received a mandate to make preparations for an international conference on the Indian Ocean. However, the date for its convocation has already been postponed for the fifth time, owing to the obstructionist stand taken by Washington and some of its allies in NATO.

[Adrianov] I note, incidentally, that we have already spoken about Washington's insistent striving to artificially connect the problems of the Indian Ocean with the solution of the Afghan issue.

[Agayants] That was earlier when the U.S. representatives at the United Nations announced that there could be no question of convening a conference on the Indian Ocean while there were Soviet troops in Afghanistan. But now the White House has quite different motives. It has started to state that the conference should not, according to it, be convened while the war is continuing between Iran and Iraq. The escalation of the military operations of those two countries, President Reagan announced, represents a threat to the interests of the United States and its friends and allies. That is quite a reversal.

[Kassis] I would like to draw attention to this circumstance. The essence of it is that in some places, it is being circulated in Western propaganda that the source of tension in the Indian Ocean is the rivalry between the great powers. Such an interpretation does not correspond to the actual state of affairs and is there simply not objective, all the more so since it does not stand up in the face of the facts. Even an elementary comparison allows one to convince oneself that the Soviet military presence in the ocean is extremely insignificant in its scale and has remained unchanged for a number of years. Its character differs radically from that of the United States. To see this, it is sufficient to compare the composition and structure of the groups of Soviet ships and the fleets of the United States located in the Indian Ocean. In their operational and tactical specifications, moreover, the Soviet ships are not intended for use against the seaboard states since they are only called upon to neutralize the U.S. naval forces deployed there. But they have repeatedly shown what a real threat their presence represents for the countries of that area of the world.

[Agayants] Since we are talking about our ships in that region, I think it is time to recall that it was precisely our country that was the first to suggest to the United States sitting down at the negotiating table to achieve limitations on and subsequent reductions in military activity in the Indian Ocean. What is more, it was the Soviet Union that came out in favor of withdrawing from the Indian Ocean zone all naval and air forces not belonging to the littoral states. The Soviet Union announced its readiness to do that on a reciprocal basis. As far as our negotiations with the Americans are concerned, they started in 1977. But 10 years ago, it was none other than Washington that deliberately wrecked those talks when it sensed that they had started to make some progress, thanks to our constructive stand.

[Adrianov] Although almost a decade has passed since that time, the Soviet Union has repeatedly confirmed its willingness to resume the talks on this issue with the United States at any time. We are to an equal extent willing to to hold with the United States and the interested Asian countries negotiations on measures of trust in the military sphere, to apply mandates to the adjacent expanese of water of both the Indian And Pacific Oceans. Therefore, the key to the problems of the Indian Ocean by no means lies on its floor. It can be seen quite clearly on the surface. To the military doctrine on which the policy of force is based, we counterpose the conception of a balance of interests and mutaul, equal security.

Our state interests, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed in his speech at the CPSU Central Committee plenum, is not contrary to the interests of people, the working masses in any other society.

With that we end our round table meeting. All the participants thank you for your attention, respected comrades, listeners. Goodbye. All the very best to you.

United States & Canada

Gorbachev, Shultz Meet, Conduct Talks

PM231105 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Feb 88 Second Edition pp 1,2

["Meeting Between M.S. Gorbachev and George Shultz"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev met with Secretary of State George Shultz in the Kremlin on 22 February. This is another important link in the Soviet-American dialogue which is assuming an ever more substantive and regular nature. We firmly conduct the course for the improvement of Soviet-American relations, Mikhail Gorbachev said. Such is a well-considered decision of the Soviet leadership which expresses the opinion of the entire Soviet people.

We appraise the summit of last December as a major event on this road. Advancing along it we live up to the hopes of the international community. Most states rightly hold that the improvement of relations between the USSR and the United States is in the interests of the whole world.

Personal contacts and personality aspects have played an important role in this process. They have formed a definite potential of mutual understanding. But this process also reflects objective requirements of the world today. This determines the continuity in the policy of the USSR and the United States with regard to each other, the beginning to which was set in Geneva and which has been gaining momentum via Reykjavik and Washington toward the Moscow summit.

During the conversation Mikhail Gorbachev and George Shultz exchanged opinions on the progress in the implementation of the arrangements reached in December and the state of the preparation for the coming visit of President Reagan to the USSR.

We proceed from the premise that the success of this visit depends on the intensity with which the joint work will proceed on the preparation of the questions and documents which will determine the content of the new Soviet-American summit meeting, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed.

It is from these positions that the questions comprising the agenda for the coming months should be viewed.

Now for the question of the ratification of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. The interlocutors exchanged information and expressed confidence that it will be ratified although, naturally, explanations have already been necessary and will yet be necessary to convince that the treaty is reliable and equitable.

The prospects of concluding a treaty on strategic offensive arms are connected with the ratification. Mikhail Gorbachev expressed the view that while there still is time this treaty should be thoroughly prepared, although this will require much work, and not only in Geneva but particularly on the level of ministers of foreign affairs. This involves major policy issues and for this reason the principal moments of translating them into concrete accords should be constantly within the field of attention of representatives of the leadership of both countries.

Mikhail Gorbachev advanced a number of new ideas concerning concrete aspects of reducing various types of strategic nuclear arms with a view to imparting greater dynamism to the ongoing talks and the search for mutually acceptable solutions. In this connection there was a thorough discussion of the question of verification which both sides regard as more complex than in the case of the intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. The question of observing the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972 was also taken up. The interlocutors confirmed their adherence to the wording on this score which was adopted in the joint Soviet-American statement at summit level signed in Washington on 10 December.

Mikhail Gorbachev expressed amazement at the stand of the United States at the talks on banning chemical weapons, the stand that hampers the working out of an international convention, and advanced proposals that could be jointly worked out by the time of the summit in Moscow.

The interlocutors confirmed their assessment of the importance of solving the problem of conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe and agreed to step up the efforts to work out the mandate for the conference in Vienna. In this connection Mikhail Gorbachev raised acutely the question of unacceptability of the plans for "compensation" which, if implemented, can devalue the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles and everything that has been achieved in the interests of international security of late.

Regional conflicts have been thoroughly discussed. We—the USSR and the United States—must set the world an example of interaction in this most important area of international life on the basis of balancing the interests of all the parties concerned without exception, Mikhail Gorbachev said. Distrust for our sincere striving to finally stamp out the regional seats of international danger stems from the fact that they in the West continue holding that the Soviet Union is chiefly "to blame" for their existence.

The situation now favors peaceful settlement of crises. Factors of an internal nature—on the part of those who are directly involved in these crises, and factors of a general nature—the stands that became prevalent in the world community—are operating.

That is why the responsibility of the two great powers, the USSR and the United States, also increases. For 45 years these and other questions have been dominated by the concept of confrontation. Is it not time now for us to try to exercise our international responsibility on the basis of a search for coinciding interests, Mikhail Gorbachev said.

He linked the settlement of regional conflicts with the deep-rooted processes taking place in the contemporary world, with the problem of the growing interdependence of its various parts. If this is ignored, if nothing is done it will be possible, of course, to hold out for 20-30 years while increasing the risk to miss the moment when the development of events will catch everybody unawares and mankind's common home will start falling apart. Mikhail Gorbachev proposed to start a joint study of these most pressing problems.

On the question of Afghanistan the interlocutors again declared for the forthcoming round of the Geneva talks to be the last one. The Soviet Union never had and does not have any whatsoever secret plans or intentions in respect of Afghanistan like creating some sort of a bridgehead there and so forth, Mikhail Gorbachev stated. The Soviet Union will firmly and consistently act in accordance with the February 8 statement.

Mikhail Gorbachev invited George Shultz to adhere to existing accords facilitating the ending of the conflict in forms ruling out bloodshed and ensuring Afghanistan the position of an independent, nonaligned and neutral state. And this requires that the Afghans themselves settle their affairs without any outside interference.

Concerning the question of Iran-Iraq war and the Persian Gulf situation, Mikhail Gorbachev promised George Shultz to discuss some ideas he had advanced.

Mikhail Gorbachev expressed his opinion about the plan of the Middle East settlement recently proposed by the Americans: the plan is inconsistent, is not in keeping with the principle of taking into consideration the interests of all the sides involved. It emphasises intermediate measures and steps to which the USSR does not object in principle, but which, as it has already become clear to many, can yield results only in the context of the decision to convene an international conference, that is in the context of a comprehensive settlement. It was agreed to resume the exchange of opinions after George Shultz makes a trip to the Middle East.

George Shultz informed Mikhail Gorbachev of the interest in the problem of human rights he showed during his current visit.

A calm and serious discussion of the essence of the problems and ways to solve them, which characterized the conversation, showed the awareness that its participants have of the responsibility for the developments in the world today.

Taking part in the conversation were Eduard Shevardnadze, Anatoliy Dobrynin, Sergey Akhromeyev, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, Colin Powell, Michael Armacost, Rozanne Ridgway, Paul Nitze, Ambassadors Yuriy Dubinin and John Matlock.

Shultz Assesses Meetings at Press Conference

LD222155 Moscow TASS in English 2140 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 22 TASS—The two sides worked intensively in Moscow for two days, as a result of which a joint statement will be issued. Work on it is being concluded. U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz said this at a press conference at the Press Centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry today. It is justifiable to say that the outcome of the visit is positive on the whole, George Shultz noted. Progress has not been reached on all the questions discussed, but advance was made on most of them, he noted. On the whole, George Shultz favourably assessed the work of the sides over two days.

George Shultz told Soviet and foreign journalists that USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze will make a visit to Washington on March 22 and 23. He said certain most important directions which would bring closer the visit of President of the USA Ronald Reagan to the Soviet Union for a summit meeting had been established in Moscow.

George Shultz noted that the question of strategic offensive arms was central to a prolonged conversation he had had with General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and during other meetings with Soviet representatives. He said that prior to the visit to the Soviet Union the U.S. side believed that much attention should be paid to verification measures, and now the U.S. side got certain that the Soviet side had similar views on this score.

"We were able to set in motion what we believe are important efforts if we are to have the S.T.A.R.T. Treaty completed in time for the Moscow summit", said U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz.

He voiced hope that three important documents will be prepared during the talks in Geneva before the ministerial meeting in March: A joint draft protocol on inspections, a joint draft protocol on conversion and elimination of strategic offensive arms, and a joint draft memorandum of understanding which would be integral to the treaty on reductions of strategic offensive arms.

The U.S. secretary of state emphasized that it was extremely important to make this early start on these issues in view of the fact that strategic arms verification problems will be far more difficult than those in the INF Treaty.

"We also made headway on some other aspects of the strategic arms treaty", George Shultz said. "From this point of view we feel that we had 'excellent meetings' in Moscow". "We had considerable discussion in the area of nuclear testing. This is the area where we have moved forward positively", George Shultz Said. "We have agreed now to move ahead and negotiate protocols to the threshold test ban treaty and the peaceful nuclear explosions treaty, and we are saying to our delegations 'get it done' by the time of the March ministerial".

There was a worthwhile discussion of bilateral issues. The fisheries note exchange became a positive factor.

"This time at our meetings we spent a greater number of hours both in the ministerial and with General Secretary Gorbachev on regional issues. We had rather full-scale discussions involving Afghanistan, the Iran-Iraq war, the Middle East peace process, southern Africa, Central America, and the Korean peninsula. I would say that we clarified matters in some areas".

George Shultz said he had not got the slightest doubt that the Soviet Union wanted to quit Afghanistan, the question was how to do that. He said it was precisely this question that was being decided upon at the Geneva talks, and that the USA wanted the talks to be a success.

He voiced the opinion that there were quite good chances for that, and assured that the United States intended to behave so as to promote the attainment of the goals as soon as possible. However, Shultz emphasized, a certain period of delicate and intensive talks on the subject lies ahead.

In answer to Nigerian journalist's question concerning the U.S. policy in Africa, the U.S. secretary of state said the USA had interests in many African countries and did not intend to 'leave Africa'.

Touching upon the human rights issue, the U.S. secretary of state said he was gratified by the confirmation received from Eduard Shevardnadze that the only obstacle to the emigration of Soviet people from the Soviet Union was their work in the past connected with state secrets.

George Shultz pointed out that the sides agreed to hold a whole number of meetings between Soviet and U.S. human rights experts, which resulted from proposals submitted by the Soviet side. He said he had had a meeting with Andrey Sakharov Sunday night.

Calls Talks 'Valuable'

LD221733 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1547 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, speaking at a press conference at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs today, replied to questions by Soviet and foreign journalists on the results of his Moscow meeting and talks with Soviet leaders. Among things he said:

[Begin Shultz recording in English fading into Russian translation] There will be a joint statement issued that isn't quite prepared yet, but it is well under way. We have had exceptionally intensive conversations during the course of these 2 days of our stay in Moscow. First, it seems to me, it would be fair to say that the results, speaking as a whole, have been positive. As far as all the questions which we have discussed are concerned, we have not achieved progress on all issues, but with regard to the majority of the issues we have achieved progress. We have been able to pinpoint certain of the most important directions which would bring nearer President Reagan's visit here to the Soviet Union and the summit meeting.

The first question on our agenda concerned human rights and humanitarian questions. We agreed to hold a whole number of meetings between Soviet and U.S. specialists on human rights questions.

Turning now to the question of arms control, we considered an important question concerning the question of arms control, a question which is already being studied. This is the question that the Soviet side also adheres to a similar view on this score, so we were able to bring into effect what we consider to be the important efforts which are necessary in order to work out a treaty on strategic offensive arms reduction and preparations for this treaty before the summit meeting here in Moscow.

We also succeeded in making progress with regard to other aspects concerning the working out of a treaty on strategic offensive armaments. Therefore, from this point of view, we believe that our meetings were splendid ones. We also discussed questions concerning space defense, the ABM Treaty, and both sides wish to work out a corresponding document and to work out an agreement which would form the basis of a joint statement.

We had a thorough discussion within the framework of the working group, and also at the level of ministers and with Mr Gorbachev on questions of chemical armaments. We both want to see a ban on chemical armaments; we want to solve the problems of control [kontrol] connected with this, and to do everything necessary in order to ensure that this treaty wins broad support.

We devoted more hours than usual, both at the level of ministers and during the course of the conversation with the general secretary, to regional problems. I don't think we have had such a detailed discussion before. We had a pretty thorough discussion on the questions of Afghanistan, the Iran-Iraq war, the peace process in the Near East, Cambodia, southern Africa, Central America and the Korean peninsula. These issues are difficult ones, but I would venture to say that we succeeded in clarifying some of these questions; perhaps we even succeeded in laying the foundations for positive progress in other issues. Therefore, on the whole, I would describe these discussions as valuable. [end recording]

Shevardnadze Press Conference on U.S. Talks

LD221956 Moscow TASS in English 1936 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 22 TASS—The elaboration of a treaty on a 50 percent cut in nuclear arms with the preservation of the ABM Treaty and the preparation of a visit to Moscow by President Ronald Reagan of the United States are the pivot of Soviet-U.S. relations at this stage, Eduard Shevardnadze, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR stated at a press conference here today.

"We jointly move within the channel of a political dialogue started by the summit meeting in Geneva and later on continued at the meetings of the leaders of the two countries in Reykjavik and Washington," he went on to say. "The road has been marked by a number of important agreements and accords. It led us to the signing of the historic Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. This is a really great landmark in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States".

The treaty, the minister emphasized, reflects more than just coincidence of approaches and positions of the sides over one issue even if an extremely important one for the destiny of mankind. The treaty is the indicator of deep changes taking place in Soviet-U.S. relations. Still more important is the fact that the two sides regard what has been achieved so far as a step from which we can make still more significant steps into the future.

"The talks with Mr. Shultz have confirmed that the two sides want this and are confident that this can be done on the basis of the accords reached at the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and President Reagan," Eduard Shevardnadze said.

"The U.S. side and we", he pointed out, "understand quite well that we have set a difficult but realistic and feasible task before ourselves. We firmly orient ourselves towards working out a treaty on radical cuts in strategic offensive arms in the middle of this year.

"In the light of the task, the talks with the U.S. secretary of state in Moscow produced, in our view, very much. Not from the viewpoint of specific solutions to specific issues but from the viewpoint of clear determination of the scope of the forthcoming work, the determination of problems which are critically important for the destiny of a treaty on strategic offensive arms, and the establishment of conceptual framework for finding mutually-acceptable solutions."

We compared our philosophical views of the arms limitation and reduction process and were mutually gratified to point out that now that we can rely on the INF Treaty we stand on the same platform. Maybe, in some place, at different ends of it but still on the same platform. We proceed from the need to solve problems connected with the prospective treaty on strategic offensive arms dynamically, within the context of the development of trust, predictability and openness.

At the talks, Eduard Shevardnadze went on to say, we determined that there are five-six 'packages of issues' which require priority attention as critically important for the success of our entire joint undertaking. These are issues connected with the preservation of the ABM Treaty, the problems of control and verification in general, long-range sea-launched cruise missiles, mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles, issues connected with air-launched cruise missiles, the pattern and configuration of strategic offensive arms remaining after reductions.

"The exchange of views," the minister emphasized, "provided us with a more accurate idea of the nature and essense of our divergences of opinion. The main thing is that following a sober-minded and well-considered evaluation of the state of affairs as regards each of these packages of issues we came to the conclusion that there are no issues that cannot be resolved. There are lots of difficulties but there are no insurmountable ones. Constructive ideas which can and must lead us to mutually acceptable solutions were put forward on both sides."

I would also like you to remember that the visit to Moscow by the U.S. secretary of state is the first meeting in a series of planned meetings leading to the summit in Moscow.

Unlike an Olympic tournament, our goal each time is to seek 'draws', i.e. mutually-acceptable results. A different goal in politics is unacceptable. In this sense the talks with Mr. Shultz on the central issue ended in a good and resultative draw.

The human rights issue and the humanitarian sphere in general figured importantly in our talks, Eduard Shevardnadze pointed out. We cannot but be concerned over the degree of social protection of people and, first of all, that in those countries which together with us assumed certain obligations on that score under international agreements.

While developing the process of democratisation and openness and laying emphasis on self-management and on drawing working people into managing all aspects of people's life and critically regarding individual aspects of the existing practice in the field of tackling humanitarian issues in this country, we are open to criticism from the outside, to impartial and constructive criticism.

The talk with Mr. Shultz on these issues was of a detailed nature and was, as we see it, a frank and mutually-constructive one.

We arranged with the U.S. secretary of state, the minister said, that humanitarian problems and human rights issues will be given the highest priority at our subsequent meetings as well. This was our initiative which was welcomed by U.S. side.

At such talks we always discuss regional issues. But, perhaps, never before were they considered by us with such depth and had such a businesslike and practical character. One can apparently speak on the emergence of a different quality in our discussions of these issues and a different level of interest in finding a common foundation for possible joint or parallel actions.

It does not mean, of course, that we had complete mutual understanding and accord. The positions of our two countries and their approaches to a settlement of some or other conflict situations are well-known. They have few areas of coincidence.

But, as a result of the exchange of views between our leaders in Geneva, Reykjavik, Washington, and during our other contacts, there came realisation, which is growing stronger, that discussions should be centered not only on comparison of each other's stands but also on an analysis of specific realities, specific situations and comparison of mutual notions of these realities. This, we agreed, is a promising way, the minister of foreign affairs of the USSR pointed out. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1940 GMT on 22 February in a similar report adds: In concluding my statement, I would like to say that we are satisfied with the way our Soviet-U.S. talks in Moscow have proceeded.]

On the whole, the talks produced a large amount of conceptual and positional material for comprehension. A regular ministerial meeting will be held in March. We hope that at the meeting some part of what was jointly elaborated in Moscow will be turned into a real political product, Eduard Shevardnadze emphasized.

Further Shevardnadze Remarks

LD222050 Moscow TASS in English 2038 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 22 TASS—In any conflict and in any issue, there are its own priorities. With reference to an Afghan settlement, it means the Geneva process, the Geneva talks between Pakistan and Afghanistan through the personal envoy of the United Nations secretary-general, Eduard Shevardnadze, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, said at a press conference here today in answer to questions put by Soviet and foreign journalists.

He pointed out that at the Geneva talks on this subject three main documents had already been agreed upon. "As far as the fourth document—a time-table for withdrawal of Soviet troops—is concerned, there is full clarity as regards it: There is every ground to believe that the upcoming round of Afghan-Pakistani talks which begins on March 2 will be a concluding one. As for the formation of a coalition government in Afghanistan, the problem will be tackled by the Afghans themselves. Such a government cannot be formed either in Moscow, Washington or Islamabad", the Soviet minister emphasized.

In answer to the question whether the problem of revising the rules of emigration from the Soviet Union was discussed at the talks with the U.S. secretary of state, Eduard Shevardnadze stated that "it is a question of Soviet internal legislation which we do not discuss with the U.S. side. This is our internal affair. A vast amount of work is being done now to refine Soviet legislation, and the results of this work become known to both our and world public".

Speaking of humanitarian issues as a whole, the minister emphasized they were of global nature and that a mutually acceptable solution to them could be found provided there is good will.

In answer to the question about ways for a settlement in the Middle East, Eduard Shevardnadze said: "If one is to tackle seriously the problem of a Middle East settlement, it is essential to put on the agenda the problem of the convocation of an international conference under U.N. auspices with the participation of the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council. We do not visualise any other real solution. Such a principled approach is shared by all Arab states, by Palestinian movements, the European Community, and by an absolute majority of countries throughout the world. I think it is essential to pool efforts to expedite the preparation of such a conference".

Many questions dealt with the situation in the Persian Gulf and those efforts which are being made by the international community to normalise it. The minister of foreign affairs pointed out that the U.N. Security Council's resolution on the Iran-Iraq conflict was resultant of the collective work of the council members and first of all its permanent members. "Subsequent steps towards a settlement of the conflict will also be determined precisely through the collective efforts of the U.N. Security Council members. Painstaking and serious work is now under way".

"Soviet-U.S. bilateral relations have good prospects for their development and deepening", Eduard Shevardnadze said in comment on the exchange of personal notes on the questions of fisheries between the Soviet and U.S. sides. "Our two countries concluded serious agreements in the field of economic cooperation, on individual directions of scientific cooperation. A very important agreement on peaceful cooperation in outer space was signed several months ago. Talks are under way on transport and some other areas."

In answer to the question about the importance of the Soviet-U.S. conference of representatives of the public on the subject "new thinking in the nuclear age", which recently came to a close in the United States the Soviet minister emphasized the role of people's diplomacy in the work for peace. "The fact that we together with the U.S. Administration managed to sign the treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear arms was to a considerable extent achieved due to the molding of the world public opinion in favour of concluding such a treaty." At the end of the press conference Eduard Shevardnadze emphasized that there were real chances to finalise the elaboration of a draft treaty on strategic offensive arms, which is expected to be signed during the summit meeting in Moscow. "The U.S. side agrees with such an evaluation. We instructed our delegations at the talks in Geneva, and hold that this no easy task can be solved through painstaking and persistent work."

The minister of foreign affairs announced that tomorrow, on Tuesday, he would go to Prague to inform the allies and friends—the member countries of the Warsaw Treaty Organization—of the results of the talks with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz.

Ryzhkov, Shultz Discuss Trade, Economic Links

PM231131 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Feb 88 Second Edition p 4

[Text] Comrade Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, on 22 February received U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. In the course of the business-like and constructive talks, they examined important issues of Soviet-U.S. political relations, problems of world economy and the two countries' approaches toward their solution, as well as the situation in the sphere of trade and economic links between the USSR and the United States and the prospects of developing mutually profitable cooperation in this area.

Comrade Ryzhkov underlined that the issues of security, the radical reduction of weapons and real disarmament still hold a priority position on the agenda of the Soviet-U.S. political dialogue. The summit in Washington has given a powerful impetus to the process of leading Soviet-U.S. relations out of a prolonged phase of confrontation. Shultz agreed with the necessity of solving the primary problems of security in particular, the issue of profoundly reducing the number of strategic and offensive weapons, and further developing Soviet-U.S. relations in a wider context. He also spoke in favor of steps directed toward strengthening trust. To this he was told that strengthening trust in bilateral relations and in world affairs on the whole could be the result of reciprocal efforts. From the Soviet Union's side the maximum possible in this sphere has been revealed by their actions, and in our country there is a well-founded belief that a similar approach must be shown by the United States.

In light of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum, the U.S. secretary of state was informed in detail about the course of restructuring in the Soviet Union and about the implementation of radical economic reform which opens new possibilities in the sphere of international cooperation. An in-depth exchange of views took place on the issues of prospects for trade and economic links between the USSR and the United States. Both sides agreed that in the political conditions created by the results of the Washington meeting, real possibilities for mutually beneficial cooperation in this, as well as in other areas, are coming into being. Comrade Ryzhkov underlined that the Soviet-U.S. business links so far remain a sphere of unrealized potential. Neither the scale, the structure, nor the forms of economic cooperation can, in their present form, satisfy the two sides. In the Soviet Union it is believed that our two countries could become really useful to each other in the sphere of bilateral relations by developing wide, mutually profitable trade and economic links on the basis of equality, stability, and a striving to find convergent points of interest. The key to acquiring a reliable longterm base in trade and economic links is to build them on the basis of real, economic, and commercial interests. Such interests undoubtedly exist, both on the part of Soviet enterprises and organizations, and on the part of U.S. businesses. Business circles in both countries, at a time when there is a marked improvement in the general political atmosphere, are already starting to put the new situation to practical use. This makes it all the more worthwhile for the political leadership of both the Soviet Union and the United States to apply fresh efforts to maintain and consolidate the constructive processes that have taken shape in business links. The conditions must be created whereby healthy economic interest itself shapes the concrete structure of cooperation.

Shultz stated the U.S. Administration's support for the course of developing trade relations in forms which accord with the laws and norms of both countries. There was discussion of the concrete steps that both sides could take to promote business contacts between the two countries' organizations and companies. A positive assessment was given to the joint efforts by representatives of U.S. business circles and Soviet organizations and enterprises to use new forms of economic cooperation. Assessed as an important phenomenon in this sphere was the nearly-completed creation by U.S. companies and Soviet organizations of foreign-economic consortiums in both countries, whose efforts are to be directed toward intensively developing Soviet-U.S. trade and economic links, including the creation of joint ventures. It was noted that the businesslike and constructive exchange of opinions on the issues discussed was assessed positively by both sides and would be continued.

Taking part in the conversation were: for the Soviet side, V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations, Yu.M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, and Yu.V. Dubinin, USSR ambassador to the United States; and for the U.S. side, C. Powell, assistant [as published] to the U.S. President, J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, and M. Armacost and R. Ridgway, deputy [as published] secretaries of state. [Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1530 GMT on 22 February, in its "Vremya" newscast, carries a report on the Ryzhkov-Shultz talks, which adds the following: "Attending the talks on the Soviet side were Comrade Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other officials; and on the U.S. side were U.S. presidential advisor Powell and other officials accompanying George Shultz."]

Zorin Interviews Shultz on Moscow Talks

LD230031 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has granted an interview to Soviet television and radio. It was hosted by a political observer, Valentin Zorin. His first question was how Mr Shultz viewed the discussions he had had in Moscow in the context of the current Soviet-American dialogue, and what he thought the results were of the Moscow round of talks.

[Begin Shultz recording] Well, this visit to Moscow has been a very intense one. I think I've been involved with Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and General Secretary Gorbachev and Premier Ryzhkov for some 20 hours or so in the space of a day and a half, so it's been very intensive. You know how to work a guy here in the Soviet Union. But I believe that the discussions we've had have been very worthwhile, and we've seen further progress on most of the areas that we've talked about.

And this is the way to do it—to work for steady progress. To a certain extent, as things happen it's rather exciting to see our two countries able to work together and resolve problems like the INF Treaty. And at the same time, I think that we have to just keep working away. A lot of this work is pick and shovel work, where you just kind of keep after the details and keep working at it and straightening out misunderstandings which are always arising. That's the nature of the beast here, and we're working at it hard. [end recording]

Valentin Zorin reminded George Shultz of the interview he had granted the Soviet television during last summer's meeting of the big seven in Venice, where he had predicted the year 1987 would see the signing of a treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles. Many people had been sceptical about such prospects at the time, but Mr Shultz had proved to have been right. Valentin Zorin asked George Shultz if he would make another prediction concerning a treaty on strategic weapons this time. Did he think such a treaty would be signed? And whether it would have been completely drafted by the time of Mr Reagan's arrival in Moscow in the first half of this year? George Shultz:

[Begin Shultz recording] Well, I believe that sooner or later there will be a 50 percent strategic arms-cut treaty agreed to between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. The shape of the treaty is already apparent. And I believe it is quite possible that that can be done in time for the summit meeting here in Moscow between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev. I know President Reagan has told me to do everything I can to work for that end; and the general secretary has said that is his objective.

During our meetings here in Moscow in the last couple of days we've made some important headway. We've identified what I think are the critical path items that you have to get resolved if you're going to get there, and we've started early work on them, particularly the verification issues, which will be very difficult. But we've been getting started, and we made a big start in the Washington summit. We have things to work from in the INF Treaty, so we're going to put our back into it and do our best. [end recording]

Valentin Zorin wished Mr Shultz' prognosis would prove right once again. Now that the INF Treaty was going through ratification procedures, Zorin asked George Shultz if he thought the U.S. Senate would ratify it in the near future, specifically before President Reagan arrived on a visit to Moscow.

[Begin Shultz recording] My guess is that the Senate will give our work its advice and consent before the end of April. And we believe the reaction in the Senate is increasingly favorable to the INF Treaty. It started off favorable, and the more people have examined that treaty the better they like it. It's popular in the United States, and we think we already have a big majority of senators who have expressed themselves favorably.

It is instructive to look at the debate because it's very thorough; even though most senators favor it, they're examining it carefully, and particularly they're examining our positions for verification. So there's a message there about the strategic arms treaty. We have to have a very good job done, and I know that my Soviet counterparts feel the same way, because if we're going to do something as important as cut our strategic arms in half, we both have to be confident that we know what we're doing and what we agree to is going to be carried out. So this will be done very carefully on both sides; but the INF Treaty looks very good.[end recording]

The Soviet observer said people in this country, too, were very positive about the INF Treaty and viewed it as an historic step. Today this treaty was undergoing a thorough ratification discussion in the Supreme Soviet. Soviet national television had reported on this process, and the Soviet people appear to be supporting the treaty as vigorously as the Americans. Valentin Zorin asked in this question concerning Mikhail Gorbachev's statement on Afghanistan. He wondered what Mr Shultz could say about his country's attitude to that statement and the ideas it contained.

[Begin Shultz recording] Well, first of all we were shocked when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. We have felt ever since that you should leave Afghanistan, and I said that on your program last April, I think it was. And we therefore welcomed very strongly the statement of General Secretary Gorbachev recently that that was the firm intention of the Soviet Union, and he spoke about a timetable, and he spoke about a (?front end loading withdrawal), and so we like that. And we know that the talks coming up in Geneva in early March are critical; they should be the final talks on the subject, and from the standpoint of the United States, we intend to conduct ourselves in such a way as to maximize the possibilities of those talks being successful. Of course, successful means that proper arrangements are made that will achieve the objectives that people have, and that the refugees can come back into Afghanistan and the Afghans can take up their own life in their own country. [end recording]

Valentin Zorin said that during the period Mr Shultz has been secretary of state, there have been important improvements in Soviet-American relations. He said this could be attributed to the efforts taken by both sides including those taken by Mr Shultz personally. The observer asked what kind of relations George Shultz expected to exist between the Soviet Union and the United States, say by the year 2,000 and what he thought would be the share of economic contacts in these relations.

[Begin Shultz recording] Well it would seem almost inevitable that the economic relations between our countries would be much more extensive than they are now. In many ways, it is amazing they aren't more extensive, because our countries are both so large and so large a part of the world economy. But I think there is something more involved. It seems to me it is important for all of us to be trying to look ahead; and I believe you can see developments that are apparent now that are going to have a big effect on the future. And when we examine those trends together and see what they mean for the future, I think it is likely that we will find important patterns of collaboration as we look at the opportunities and look at the problems that perhaps we don't even have occuring to us today. So my guess is that the future will be a lot different; and I think as I said to the general secretary when he was in Washington that there is too much of a tendency to face the past and back into the future. What we have to do is of course be cognizant of the lessons of the past, but be ready to at least look around over our shoulders see what the future might look like and then act accordingly; and I think if we do we'll all be the beneficiaries. [end recording]

Valentin Zorin wondered whether Mr Shultz could be viewed as an optimist in what concerned the Soviet-American relations.

[Begin Shultz recording] Well, I think that we have to be realistic, we have to recognize that we have different systems, that we have different interests, (?but) we also have a lot of things where we have perhaps in common interests; and what we have to do is work at it steadily and constructively, avoid the extremes of being overly depressed when something doesn't go right because there will always be times like that, and perhaps also refrain from too much euphoria when something does go right and just keep at it, steadily. It's the steady applications of hard work and goodwill that does the job. [end recording]

The observer reminded George Shultz of his article appearing in THE WASHINGTON POST in January, in which he had called for giving up the outdated stereotypes of thinking. Valentin Zorin said this could evidently be referred to the prospects for Soviet-American relations, since to have these developing normally both countries had to abandon many old stereotypes.

[Begin Shultz recording] I think that's right. I read Mr Gorbachev's book carefully and I found it very interesting. I found some things I didn't agree with and I didn't like and I found a lot of things that I thought were very sensible, but it was a good book to read, an important book; and it does deal with the fact that things are changing and we have to think in fresh ways about them, and so I welcome that sentiment, I agree with it. I try to even do it myself once in a while. [end recording]

That was the interview the U.S. secretary of state, George Shultz, has granted to the Soviet television and radio.

Shultz-Shevardnadze Talks End With Statement

LD221717 Moscow TASS in English 1714 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 22 TASS—Talks between members of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Eduard Shevardnadze and Secretary of State of the United States George Shultz ended here today.

A joint statement was adopted on the results of the talks.

Joint Statement Published

PM231349 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Feb 88 Second Edition p 4

["Joint Statement"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The talks between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and G. Shultz, U.S. Secretary of state, ended on 22 February. A joint statement has been adopted on the results of the talks and is published below.

The first of a series of agreed-upon meetings between Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of foreign affairs, and George Shultz, United States secretary of state, was held in Moscow 21-23 February.

All aspects of Soviet-American relations were discussed in detail during the conversations in which Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Lieutenant-General Colin Powell took part. Preparation was started for the summit meeting between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President of the United States Ronald Reagan to be held in Moscow in the first half of 1988.

Secretary of State George Shultz and Colin Powell were received by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and met with Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Ryzhkov.

The sides agreed that it is important to advance steadily in the months ahead in the entire set of Soviet-American relations, including arms limitation and reduction, human rights, regional problems and bilateral matters. For this purpose they gave priority attention to the implementation of arrangements and instructions on which the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the President of the United States agreed upon during the Washington meeting. USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz will meet in Washington in March to discuss progress toward the achievement of these goals and to continue close coordination of actions for the preparation of President Reagan's visit to the USSR.

During the meetings in the past two days, the sides held a candid [otkrovennoye] and constructive discussion of human rights and humanitarian matters.

They discussed outstanding matters related to talks on nuclear and space arms, nuclear testing, armed forces and conventional armaments, chemical weapons.

They confirmed the obligation contained in the joint statement adopted as a result of the Washington summit to intensify the efforts in order to conclude the drafting of a treaty on strategic offensive arms limitation and reduction and all related documents "at the earliest possible date, preferably in time for signature of the treaty during the next meeting of leaders of state in the first half of 1988".

The ministers discussed the entire complex of questions related to the treaty, having given special attention to the quest for the solution to problems on which the stands differ so far. Specifically, emphasising the importance of verification, they instructed their representatives at the talks to prepare for the March ministerial meeting the joint drafts of the protocol on inspection, of the protocol on conversion or elimination of strategic offensive arms and a draft memorandum of understanding which will be integral to the treaty on reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms.

As to the ABM Treaty which was discussed during the Washington summit, they also instructed their representatives in the talks to seek arrangement, basing themselves on the wording contained in the joint statement of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President of the United States Ronald Reagan of December 10, 1987.

Noting the progress achieved at the Soivet-American full-scale, stage-by-stage talks on matters related to the problem of nuclear testing, the ministers instructed their delegations to speed up the work on the protocols on the verification of the 1974 and 1976 Soviet-American treaties on underground nuclear explosions so as to conclude the drafting of the protocols to be considered at the next ministerial meeting. The ministers agreed that this reflects the aim set at the Washington summit of ensuring the ratification of the two treaties by both sides in accordance with their national legislation and practice.

The ministers discussed the questions related to truly global, all-embracing banning of chemical weapons, lending itself to effective verification. They discussed outstanding problems, exchanged views on the ways of confidence-building and enhancing openness and agreed to study the ideas about concrete ways of ensuring progress and intensifying talks to conclude a convention applying to all countries capable of having chemical weapons.

There was an exchange of opinions on the state of affairs at the Vienna meeting on working out a mandate for talks on armed forces and conventional armaments. This made it possible to specify the positions of the sides and achieve their more profound understanding. The results of these consultations will be brought to the notice of appropriate representatives in Vienna so as to promote the conclusion of the work on the mandate.

The ministers had an extensive and frank exchange of opinions on regional matters including Afghanistan, Iran-Iraq war, peaceful settlement in the Middle East, Cambodia, southern Africa, Central America and the Korean peninsula.

The ministers discussed the work to expand areas of bilateral cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union. They exchanged personal notes on development of bilateral cooperation in fisheries.

Dobrynin, Powell Hold 'Constructive' Talks

LD221634 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 22 TASS—Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Anatoliy Dobrynin had a conversation on February 21 with General Colin Powell, assistant to the U.S. President for national security affairs.

During the conversation, which was of a constructive nature, they discussed some questions connected with the holding of the Soviet-American summit in Moscow in the first half of this year.

Vorontsov, Other Officials See Shultz Off

LD230917 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0700 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz left the USSR today. At the Sheremetyevo airport he was seen off by USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Vorontsov, Dubinin, USSR ambassador in the United States; and other officials. Matlock, U.S. ambassador in the USSR, was among the party seeing him off. Powell U.S. presidential assistant for national security affairs, has also left Moscow.

Karpov on Significance of Shultz Visit

LD192030 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian
1938 GMT 19 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, 19 Feb (TASS)—A TASS diplomatic correspondent reports:

"We attach great importance to the forthcoming visit to the USSR and to Moscow by U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. It is the first of the planned series of meetings between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and the U.S. secretary of state, meetings which are intended to prepare for the arrival in Moscow of U.S. President Ronald Reagan in the first half of this year," Viktor Karpov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry's problems of Arms Control and Disarmament Directorate, said today in an interview with a TASS correspondent.

Why is the first visit by George Shultz in 1988 being treated with so much attention in Moscow? "Unfortunately, one has to note that in the 2 months since Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Washington, nothing of substance, if you like, has happened in Soviet-U.S. relations which would give us the opportunity to talk about significant advances," Viktor Karpov noted. Against this background, the meetings with the secretary of state in Moscow are intended to set the tone for further dialogue between the USSR and the United States, primarily in the sphere of reducing strategic offensive arms."

It would seem that the joint instructions to the delegations that were approved in Washington by Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan should have provided momentum to the Geneva talks. But on 14 January, when the latest round began there, a tendency on the part of the U.S. side to replace the serious hunt for solutions to issues with cosmetic operations began to be discerned. At times one may observe direct attempts to depart from the Washington accords, he said. Here is a specific example: On 15 January the Soviet delegation put forward suggestions for a protocol regarding the observance of the ABM Treaty and the nonwithdrawal from it for an agreed period in precise accordance with the Washington accords. On 22 January the U.S. delegation also put forward its document, but not on the observance of the ABM Treaty, but based on both switching from this treaty to a new regime based on strategic defense. "In essence, instead of observing the ABM Treaty," said Viktor Karpov, "we were being offered a new treaty that would have meant the implementation of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative."

At the same time, it is scarcely worthwhile to paint everything in a black color. A certain amount of work has been done in the sphere of strategic offensive arms. Some odiously demanding U.S. positions are being subjected to change. For example, the United States has expressed a readiness to remove the sublevel of 1,650 units for ground-base ballistic missiles with more than 6 warheads which was submitted by them earlier. It is obvious that this is a patently discriminatory indicator for the Soviet Union. In this regard, Viktor Karpov showed your correspondent a front cover made of thick cardboard, on which was written: "Treaty Between the USSR and the United States on Reducing And Limiting Strategic Offensive Arms"—the joint draft treaty on strategic offensive weapons as it stood on 16 February, the result of the great work done by the sides. However, it contains a whole series of gaps which must be eliminated by agreeing the positions of the sides." [no opening quotemark as received]

"We are relying on the U.S. secretary of state to clarify the positions of the U.S. side during his talks in Moscow—and evidently he will be meeting Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee—something that will, in particular, allow us to come nearer to resolving the question of limiting long-range sea-based Cruise missiles and air-based Cruise missiles on heavy bombers, as well as several issues of mutual verification," stressed Viktor Karpov. "And it goes without saying that, as before, the main topic that arises in this connection is the link established in Washington between the opportunities for reducing strategic offensive weapons and observing the ABM Treaty."

Pogodin Assesses Shultz Talks in Moscow

LD231325 Moscow World Service in English
1110 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Aleksandr Pogodin commentary]

[Text] The media in many countries are widely discussing the meeting in Moscow between the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, and the United States secretary of state, George Shultz, as well as the talks between the

Soviet foreign minister, Eduard Shevardnadze, and his American counterpart. More from our commentator Aleksandr Pogodin. This is what he writes:

Many issues were discussed at the Moscow tals and I would like to single out a few that have evoked the greatest interest, in my opinion. Notably, the participants in the talks spoke in definite terms, as something settled, about the visit to Moscow in the first half of the year by President Reagan. I guarantee that the meeting will be held, said Eduard Shevardnadze. This statement should put an end to the speculations and doubts lately about the possibility of the next summit. The meeting should improve Soviet-American relations, which is in the interests of the entire world, as it is widely admitted.

Naturally, success of the United States President's visit to Moscow will depend on how intensively the joint work is done to prepare the issues and documents for the new Soviet-American summit. Various aspects of the disarmament problem are among the issues. Ratification of the Soviet-American treaty on scrapping medium- and shorter-range missiles is now being considered in Moscow and Washington. It is very important that the parties to the talks express confidence that the treaty will be ratified. That is significant for the INF Treaty itself and for the drafting of a treaty to reduce and limit strategic offensive armaments.

There are enough complicated problems involved. The verification issue is one. During his meeting with George Shultz, Mikhail Gorbachev put forward a number of new ideas on specific aspects of reducing various types of strategic nuclear arms by making more dynamic the current talks and the search for mutually acceptable solutions. That should help complete the drafting of that treaty at an early date so that it might be signed during the next Soviet-American summit. Naturally, the issue of cutting back the strategic offensive armaments is inseparable from the problem of compliance with the ABM Treaty in the way it was signed in 1972. The common desire was voiced to press for an accord in this area based on the formulas worked out during the December summit.

It is also notable that the talks in Moscow dealt with the problems of conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe. Both sides regard the problems as very important. In this connection, Mikhail Gorbachev raised very acutely the issue that it is inadmissible to have compensation plans, as such plans can devalue the INF Treaty, if they are carried out. In general, they will cancel out everything that has been lately attained in the interests of international security. The Soviet leader also expressed surprise over the United States' stand at the talks on banning chemical weapons. That stand was slowing down the drafting of an international convention.

Issues related to a peaceful settlement of regional conflicts were also examined. Mikhail Gorbachev said the present situation is conducive to such a settlement of crises. Domestic factors are involved here, too. These are the policies of those who are directly involved. There are also general factors related to the stands that have become predominant in the world community. As Mikhail Gorbachev put it, the USSR and the United States must now show to the rest of the world an example of cooperation in this timely sphere in international life, based on a balance of interests of all the sides involved without exception.

This position fully applies to the Afghan problem, too. The Soviet Union intends to act consistently in keeping with the Statement by Mikhail Gorbachev of 8 February that set the date for starting the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan and for completing it within 10 months. It is highly important that the United States, too, should abide by the current understandings, thus helping to stop the conflict in the forms ruling out bloodshed and ensuring for Afghanistan the status of an independent, nonaligned and neutral state. It is necessary for this purpose that the Afghans should settle their affairs themselves, without any outside interference.

I have named only a few problems that were discussed in Moscow. The entire discussions were noted by the realization by the particiapnts in the talks of their responsibility for world developments.

Glazunov Assesses Talks With U.S. in Moscow

LD221434 Moscow World Service in English
1110 GMT 22 Feb 88

["Assessment" by political observer Viktor Glazunov]

[Text] Hope has been generated just by the beginning of the talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz. Reportedly progress has been made on the entire range of issues which are of worldwide significance, above all the issues of promoting security and further reducing nuclear missiles.

Notably both sides have spoken up for more vigorous actions to complete drafting a treaty on cutting in half the strategic offensive armaments by complying with the ABM Treaty as it was signed in 1972. Another thing has been confirmed—the draft treaty about the 50 percent cuts must be ready by the Soviet-U.S. summit scheduled to be held in Moscow during the first half of the year, when the treaty should be signed. That is in keeping with the arrangements made last December at the Washington summit between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

I think the work done in Moscow will stimulate the corresponding talks in Geneva, which have been obviously at a standstill lately, due to attempts by the U.S. side to depart from the Washington summit accords.

There is another notable point about the Moscow talks, this is an exchange of views on ratifying the treaty to scrap medium- and shorter-range missiles. The process of ratification is underway, and there seems to be no reason to doubt that the treaty will be ratified, but there is concern over attempts to oppose the treaty from the flanks, so to say. With active participation of the United States, NATO is working out plans for measures to compensate for the INF Treaty, to replace the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles to be eliminated, a buildup is to be made in armaments that don't fall under the treaty. This runs counter to the line taken at the Soviet-U.S. Washington summit and that line is quite clear—to move toward a lowering of military confrontation, particularly in the nuclear missiles.

That also applies to the chemical weapons as another type of arms of mass annihilation. It is impossible to draft an international convention on the elimination of these weapons and simultaneously start manufacturing a new type of them, binary shells, as the United States has done. It would be fine to have these issues which are causing concern clarified in Moscow as well. Past experience has shown that meetings between Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz largely help to solve disputed issues. Hopefully, the current talks won't be an exception and, of course, the extra stimulus are the talks of Mikhail Gorbachev and Nikolay Ryzhkov with George Shultz. In any case quite definite expectations are linked with the Moscow talks, which should serve to promote successful preparations for another Soviet-U.S. summit.

U.S. Ratification Hearings Continue in Congress

LD202126 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 20 Feb 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] In the supreme legislative bodies of our country and of the United States, the discussion of the intermediate- and shorter-range missile treaty continues. Well, yesterday we saw an interesting report from the Supreme Soviet on how the discussions are going there. In the U.S. Congress, there's still a majority in favor of the treaty; but there is also a dangerous tendency. The atmosphere created during the Gorbachev visit to the United States is clearly not to everyone's liking. That is what Comrade Gorbachev said in his speech at the Central Committee plenum. The opponents of the treaty in the United States have now become more active. We got through to our correspondent in Washington, Vladimir Dunayev, and asked him how the hearings in the Senate are going.

[Dunayev] For the most part, all the witnesses—almost all the witnesses—are speaking in favor of ratification. Even the rightwingers, who hate our country, such as Jeane Kirkpatrick, who was the U.S. representative at the U N, or Richard Perl, until recently a Pentagon hawk, at the Pentagon till recently; he's now retired, but he's still a hawk—both she and he have told the Senate committee they're not against ratification, though they obviously are against it, and that the Senate only needs to make amendments to it: with amendments, it can by all means be ratified. Well, what do amendments mean? They mean that ratification will take a very long time, they mean new talks with the Soviet Union, they mean the planned Moscow summit can't discuss further measures toward disarmament, reduction of strategic offensive arms, because the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles won't have been ratified. So those are the tactics they're employing.

Bush Remarks on INF Treaty Reported

LD210921 Moscow TASS in English 0808 GMT 21 Feb 88

[Text] London February 21 TASS—U.S. Vice-President George Bush has described the Soviet-American INF Treaty and the procedure of putting it into life is "a new chapter in East-West relations".

In an article printed in the newspaper SUNDAY TIMES today he underlines that this is the first treaty which in the final account will lead to elimination of part of the nuclear arsenals of the two countries. "While this step has broad popular support", the vice-president writes, "some official governmental circles fear a "weakening of deterrence". "I do not share this fear. I draw great confidence from the new verification regimen that is part of the INF Treaty", he writes. American scientists will be allowed to visit Soviet weapons plants, while Soviet inspectors will have equivalent access to U.S. installations.

Sharing his impressions of the United States' visit by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, the vice-president notes that the Soviet leader "had a great impact on the people of the U.S."

In the same article George Bush, enumerating a standard set of "claims" to the Soviet Union, specifically on the question of "human rights" and Afghanistan, writes: "It will be decades, in my view, before we can hope for relations with the Soviet Union to improve to the point where we can make major reductions in our defensive strengths". What we can and should do through the rest of this decade and into the 1990's is, he says, is to "seek to establish a new more stable basis for deterrence". According to the vice-president, this will be brought to fruition by continued strategic defence initiative research, which is known to lead only to the unrestrained arms race.

U.S. Response to Afghanistan Initiative Viewed

LD191619 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1223 GMT 19 Feb 88

[Text] Washington, 19 Feb (TASS)—TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports: C. Redman, official spokesman of the U.S. State Department, has stated that the

United States "is in agreement with Pakistan that the formation in Kabul of a transitional government would be desirable and would facilitate the withdrawal of Soviet troops." In an interview with the Voice of America radio station, Secretary of State G. Shultz asserted that the creation "of a transitional government would be of great benefit to all."

Many U.S. politicians and experts recognize the untrue nature of such demands. Even such a "hardliner" in regard to the USSR as Zbigniew Brzezinski, former national security aide to President J. Carter, has pointed out that the United States should not be allowed to delay the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan over the issue of creating a transitional government. Brzezinski warned that it is not in the U.S. interest to "get stuck in difficult negotiations" over a trasitional government.

At the same time, the U.S. Administration is evading giving any precise answer to the question of when the United States intends to cease military aid to the anti-government armed formations in Afghanistan, aid which, according to THE WASHINGTON POST, amounted to about $600 million last year. C. Redman asserted that the United States "is ready to play a role" in putting an end to such aid and to "fulfill its promises." However, he at once made the proviso that until accords are worked out in Geneva, the United States "will assume no obligations."

G. Shultz, in a conversation with journalists relayed by the U.S. Information Agency Worldnet, declared in his turn that the United States "will insist" that at the same time as U.S. military support ends, "the Soviet Union will cease all aid to the Afghan Government." This position, described by the NEW YORK TIMES as a "new demand" from Washington, is getting the full backing of right-wing circles in the United States.

Reagan Discusses Draft Budget in Radio Address

LD210750 Moscow TASS in English 0738 GMT 21 Feb 88

[Text] Washington February 21 TASS—The White House is trying to use to the maximum the draft federal budget for fiscal 1989 for its propaganda purposes. The draft budget submitted this week for the consideration of U.S. Congress envisages government spendings exceeding one trillion dollars.

Making his regular radio address last Saturday, President Reagan said that the new budget would "put our fiscal house in order". However, these optimistic forecasts are not shared by many economists and congressmen. William Gray, chairman of the Committee on Budget of the House of Representatives, said in a reply address that in many respects the budget did not measure up to the needs and values of America. According to Gray, the draft budget put forward by the President suggests that more money be spent on the creation of space living quarters than on meeting the needs of the homeless in the earth. Gray made special mention of the tremendous problem of the federal budget deficit which had almost tripled during Reagan's Presidency to reach the unprecedented level of 221 billion dollars in fiscal 1986. As a result of it, he continued, the U.S. federal debt has more than doubled since 1980, and by next January it will reach some 2.8 trillion dollars.

President Reagan also mentioned this complicated problem. Eight years ago he had made the promise to balance the federal budget one of the central issues of his electoral campaign. Now the President did not even recall his former promises and assured Congress that "if our proposed budget is enacted, deficit spending will have dropped from 221 billion dollars in fiscal year 1986 to 130 billion dollars in fiscal year 1989". However, the Budget Bureau of U.S. Congress is less optimistic in its forecasts. It predicts that deficit spending will reach 176 billion dollars next year and will remain on this level for several more years to come. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, enormous budget deficit is a legacy that the Reagan administration will pass over to its successors.

The excessive growth of military spendings during Reagan's Presidency is one of the main reasons for a rapid increase of budget deficit which has reached astronomical figures. According to the "Citizens for Reasonable Economy" public organization, they more than doubled from 1980 to 1988. The draft budget for the next fiscal year envisages military expenditures amounting to 299.5 billion dollars. President Reagan said in his radio address that the budget "includes fundings for the minimum defense program needed to keep our country safe". However, the thing is that about all the main military programs remained intact, while the Pentagon's budget will be increased by 2 per cent in real terms as against the current year.

U.S. Asia-Pacific Bases Linked to SDI

PM191935 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Feb 88 Second Edition p 3

[D. Belskiy article: "Asian Test Range for SDI"]

[Text] As the U.S. newspaper DEFENSE NEWS reported recently, the United States has carried out the first test of elements of the command and control system for the "star wars" program. During the experiment, sensors not only on earth but also on satellites tracked the flight of an ICBM, pinpointing the parameters of its flight from the moment it was launched at the Vandenberg Air Force Base until it fell into the Pacific Ocean. At the same time, apparatus to identify real and dummy targets was in operation. The test was yet another act in the "star wars" scenario which is being created by the Pentagon.

It is no accident that the Asian-Pacific region was chosen as the "stage." The "Heritage Foundation," which is a "think tank" for the U.S. Administration, once showed in a special report that SDI is directly relevant to Asia. What was stressed was the significance of such factors as the role of Asia in the U.S. global nuclear strategy, the stationing in the region of large groupings of U.S. armed forces, and also the possible involvement of Japan, South Korea, and Australia in the implementation of SDI. From the military viewpoint, the analysis stressed, the implementation of SDI in the Asian-Pacific region would help to strengthen "the defense of the United States and its allies" in the region.

The Pentagon is developing the "star wars" front across the entire perimeter of the Asian-Pacific region and in different parts of it. There are numerous strongpoints in Alaska, Australia, the Philippines, California, Micronesia, and Hawaii. They are being adapted for monitoring space and for utilizing space strike systems. The biggest experiments have been carried out in the Hawaiian Islands, U.S. specialists have stressed, including tests of space strike means and laser ABM technology, with the spaceship "Discovery's" orbital stage being used.

A laser beam from the Air Force ground station on the island of Maui, "penetrating" hundreds of kilometers of near-earth space, hit a mirror on board "Discovery" and bounced off it to intercept a "Terrier-malamute" missile launched from a test range on the Hawaiian Islands. In this way one possible component of a space-based ABM system—a laser device—was tested. But the first such "shot" did not succeed because of an erroneous command from earth—the spacecraft was wrongly oriented in space.

Micronesia is called upon to play a special role. Hitherto the range in the region of the Kwajalein atoll has been used for testing the Minuteman, MX, and Trident ICBM systems. Now the base on the atoll has been turned into a Pentagon "electronic fortress" from which the tests of space weapons components carried out by the United States in near-earth space are monitored.

An entire system of a "Pacific Ocean radar barrier" has been set up to gather information about targets in space. In Southeast Asia there is the "Cobra Talon" station in the Philippines (the island of Luzon) in San Miguel, and in the central section of the Pacific Ocean there is "Altair" on Kwajalein atoll. In 1988-1989 a station for tracking space targets will be built on the island of Saipan (Mariana Islands). But, as the newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST writes, these radar units can also be used to destroy targets in space. The creation of a system for monitoring the space situation at altitudes from 5 to 40,000 km is being completed. It has been deployed in the Hawaiian Islands, in South Korea, and on Diego Garcia. The system will enter operation with the commissioning of the last such station on Portuguese territory in 1988, for which 20 million dollars were earmarked in 1986.

In Australia there are U.S. communications bases whose electronic and technical potential makes it possible to use them for a wide range of "star wars" purposes. At Pine Gap—in central Australia—there is one of the main facilities of the U.S. National Security Agency—a center for receiving information and transmitting commands to satellites (code-named "Merino"). Its task is to collect data on ground and space targets.

The U.S. base in Narrangara called "Casino" (500 km northwest of Adelaide) is another potentially important link in the "star wars" program. It is a center for receiving and processing data from reconnaissance satellites under the direct authority of the U.S. Armed Forces' joint space command.

On the southern approaches to the Asian Continent, on Diego-Garcia atoll in the middle of the Indian Ocean, the Pentagon is siting a station of the "Spacetrack" antisatellite system, which "star wars" strategists intend should girdle the entire earth.

Another step toward "star wars" is Washington's intention to create also a regional ABM system with space-based elements in northeast Asia with the participation of Japan and South Korea. This project was presented by the United States to a delegation of government experts and specialists from private corporations who studied SDI in April 1986 in the United States. The Pentagon presented it as an opportunity to deploy "an interim system using such traditional means as antimissile missiles and ground radars, supplemented by long-range early warning aircraft."

The project entitled "Japan's New Defense System" developed by the Japan Defense Agency, essentially a regional SDI, will serve this purpose. Military tracking, guidance, and communications satellites will be part of it. The JAPAN TIMES reported this in September 1987, citing sources in the Japan Defense Agency.

The upcoming modernization of the Japanese islands' air defense system may be linked with the implementation of the U.S. "star wars" project. Twenty-six "Patriot" surface-to-air missile complexes, supplied by the United States or produced under U.S. license in Japan, will be sited there in the early nineties. Research is also under way to improve this complex' radar station and the missile guidance system so that in the future the complex could combat ballistic missile reentry vehicles.

Claims that Asian security will supposedly gain from implementation of the SDI program are a deliberate lie. Preparation for "star wars" will not lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons in the Asian-Pacific region. Moreover, it will open the way to a new round of the arms race. And this is directly at odds with the position of the majority of states in the region and their peoples' fundamental interests.

Significance, Future of U.S. Foreign Bases

LD212123 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 21 Feb 88

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Vsevolod Ovchinnikov]

[Text] The agreement on eliminating intermediate- and shorter-range missiles and prospects for radically reducing strategic nuclear arsenals—all this makes the issue of the assymetry in various arms classes and types of armed forces more topical. This assymetry has resulted from historical circumstances, first of all because the United States at one time surrounded the Soviet Union with a circle of military bases. We had to counter the U.S. threat from our own territory. And the greater the reduction of strategic offensive weapons, the greater the importance of the U.S. forward-base systems. Washington strategists wistfully recall the time when the United States kept the Soviet Union in its sights while remaining out of reach itself. The United States realizes that in the process of disarmament the value of U.S. foreign bases will grow. Yet, to its dismay, it is precisely now that the U.S. military presence in some allied countries has been brought into question.

In Europe, accords on bases with Spain, Greece, Turkey, Portugal, and, in Asia, with the Philippines, are expiring. After hard bargaining Washington had to agree to remove F-16 fighter bombers from Spain—they are to be relocated in Italy. The U.S. Administration described as an unfriendly gesture the demands by Madrid, clearly afraid that other countries might follow the Spanish example. There is enough trouble. Ankara refuses to station Lance tactical nuclear missiles in the country. Athens demands that the U.S. arms supplies to Turkey should not exceed those to Greece. Parliamentarians in Manila offer to extend the presence of the U.S. military base on the condition only that the United States covers the Philippines foreign debt.

In a word, everybody demands that U.S. aid should be increased, whereas, on the contrary, it needs to be reduced. And against this background the notorious issue of compensation has become a handy pretext for consolidating and expanding the U.S. military presence at foreign bases and, at the same time, giving impetus to the military integration of NATO's West European members.

China

Yazov Sees Improvement in Chinese Ties

OW231039 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1500 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Report on speech by Dmitriy Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, at a "grand meeting" held in Moscow on 22 February to celebrate the 70th anniversary of the founding of the Soviet Army-Navy]

[Text] The Soviet Armed Forces have been guarding the gains of the revolution for 7 decades. The revolution could not exist without military protection. As early as the day after the victory of the October Revolution, the Soviet state declared its adherence to peace. But its peace-loving proposals were turned down. International imperialism imposed a civil war and an armed intervention upon our people. For the Soviet republic the question was to be or not to be. Then, Lenin and the Communist Party promptly built the Soviet Armed Forces.

Yazov emphatically points out: As early as 7 decades ago, the victory of the Soviet Armed Forces over internal counterrevolutionaries and foreign armed interventionists proved that the army of the working people enjoys their undivided support. With the successful development of the socialist economy in those years, the Soviet Army became a strong force. In the 4-year-long war against German fascist aggression, [word indistinct] the Soviet people and Armed Forces won a victory of historic importance. After driving the aggressors out of the native land, our Armed Forces liberated the people of many European and Asian countries from the aggressors' yoke.

USSR Defense Minister Yazov then says: After the war, the military threat from the imperialist bloc in the West compelled us to take countermeasures to ensure our own security.

On Soviet military thinking, Yazov emphasizes: This is a concept of pure self-defense. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have pledged never to start a war against any state if they themselves do not become a target of attack. They will never be the first to use nuclear weapons; they have no territorial claims on any other state; and they do not view any other state as an enemy. The Soviet Union and other friendly and cooperative socialist countries [she hui zhu yi you hao he zuo guo jia] are ready to establish relations with all countries in the world on the basis of the principle of peaceful coexistence and with mutual account taken of one another's interests and security.

On the treaty between the Soviet Union and the United States on eliminating their intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, USSR Defense Minister Yazov emphatically points out: The treaty envisions the elimination of these two classes of missiles in Asia, too, something that is of fundamental importance for military detente in that region. In strict compliance with its defense doctrine, the Soviet Union has not built up its ground forces in the Far East for many years. Moreover, the Soviet Union has reduced a large number of its troops stationed along the Soviet-Chinese border, and some of our troops have also been withdrawn from Mongolia. We have shown restraint as well in conducting troop exercises, and we have not increased their number and scale.

The defense minister says: The positive changes in our relations with the PRC are an important factor in promoting the improvement of the situation in the Asia-Pacific region.

Shipping Experts Leave for Border River Talks

*OW230405 Khabarovsk Domestic Service
in Russian 0930 GMT 22 Feb 88*

[Text] A delegation of shipping experts, headed by Sukhov, chief of the Amur River Steamship Line, left today for the PRC. It will take part in the joint Soviet-Chinese Commission on navigation on border sections of the rivers Argun, Amur, Ussuri, Sungari, and Lake Khanka.

Wu Xueqian Fetes Iraq's Foreign Minister 'Aziz

*OW230513 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress
in Mandarin to Asia-Pacific Region 1300 GMT
22 Feb 88*

[Text] At a reception held in Beijing in honor of 'Aziz, Iraq's deputy prime minister and foreign minister, who is now visiting China, Wu Xueqian, Politburo and CPC Central Committee member and foreign minister, said: The resolution by the UN Security Council is a good foundation for sensibly and justly settling the conflict between Iran and Iraq. The Chinese foreign minister pointed out: The PRC closely watches the development of the situation in the Middle East. We resolutely denounce the crimes committed by the Israeli authorities against the Palestinian people, and support these people's just struggle for their national rights. Wu Xueqian emphatically pointed out: China advocates the convocation of an international meeting on Middle East issues under the auspices of the United Nations, to be attended by all parties concerned, including the PLO.

Fedorov Lauds PRC Support for Mideast Peace

*OW111035 Moscow International Service
in Mandarin 0100 GMT 5 Feb 88*

[Station observer Federov commentary from the "World Today" program]

[Text] The vigorous demonstrations staged by Palestinians in Israeli-occupied territories have gone on for nearly 2 months. It can be said that the situation there has reached the boiling point. The issue of how to settle the Arab-Israeli conflict has always been an international topic of discussion. In this connection, Federov, a station observer, writes:

The Soviet stand is very clear. The USSR believes that the Middle East issue must be settled as early as possible, and that the conflict in the Middle East has become red hot. It involves so many countries that an eruption in the Middle East, which is possible, may trigger a catastrophe for the entire human race.

As to how to deal with this, the USSR has its own answer, which is universally known. The Soviet proposals have been concisely and comprehensively elaborated in the Soviet plan for Middle East peace. The plan is very simple. It consists of three principal ingredients: First, Israel must return all the territories it seized in 1967 to the Arabs; second, the national right of self-determination of the Palestinian Arabs must be safeguarded, including the right of establishing their own state; and third, the independence of all countries within their universally acknowledged boundaries must be safeguarded.

Thus, the Soviet three-point plan is in fact an international guarantee for peaceful coexistence among countries in the Middle East [words indistinct] proved by experience gained over the last several decades. Considering the fact that points one and two may not be attained without the participation of the international community, the USSR in late January reiterated its universally known proposal; namely, to call an international meeting on the Middle East issue. The proposal has received especially wide support throughout the world. Countries like Israel and the United States, which until recently did not even want to hear the proposals, verbally supported the convening of such a peace meeting. Everyone knows, however, that there is still a big gap between words and deeds. The Soviet proposals are meant specifically to speed the process of overcoming this gap, and so we have urged the UN Security Council to discuss all issues relevant to holding the international meeting.

In short, the USSR proposes that words should be translated into action. In this connection, I would like to emphasize that the permanent members of the UN Security Council can play a special role in this regard. According to the UN Charter, the permanent members of the Security Council shoulder the especially heavy responsibility of safeguarding peace. We are pleased to note that the People's Republic of China, a great socialist power [wei da di she hui zhu yi qiang guo] and a permanent member of the Security Council, has undertaken great responsibility in upholding peace in the Middle East. We are deeply convinced that, if the USSR and China make concerted efforts to expedite the process of convening an international meeting on peace in the Middle East, they will be acting in the interest of the entire world.

A couple of days ago, Al-Faysal, minister of foreign affairs of Saudi Arabia, visited Moscow. In his talks with Gromyko, chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the minister, in the name of Arab countries in the Gulf region, voiced full support for the Soviet proposal of convening an international meeting to discuss Middle East issues.

Li Peng Denies Economic Reform Slowdown

*PM111745 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian5 Feb 88 First Edition p 5*

[TASS report: "No Slowing in Pace of Reform"]

[Text] Beijing, 4 Feb—The claims disseminated abroad that the pace of reform in China has been slowing since the 13th CPC Congress do not match up to reality, Li

Peng, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo Standing Committee and acting premier of the PRC State Council, said in a talk with C. Yeutter, the U.S. representative at trade talks.

In the Chinese leader's words, the PRC has now defined the main direction and overall scheme for carrying out the reforms, which will be continually expanded and improved. Along with the improvements to the system of contractual liability for production the Chinese Government is examining the possibility and ways of implementing other measures, including reforms of foreign trade, capital construction, and control over the utilization of raw and other materials.

Trade Journal Studies PRC Joint Ventures

OW230135 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] In a report on the organization of joint ventures in China, the Soviet journal FOREIGN TRADE describes the terms for establishing joint ventures, their management, and t[illegible]ing of capital in China.

The journal notes that the establishment of joint ventures is an important aspect in China's policy of opening to the outside world, bringing in foreign capital and advanced technology.

Today China has over 4,000 joint ventures, but not all meet the requirements China has set for upgrading the technological aspect of its national economy. In China, the amount of foreign capital brought in by key economic departments represents only 30 percent of the total amount of foreign capital.

The journal also points out that most of the joint ventures are assembling units, where new technology is nonessential.

Northeast Asia

No Tae-u Announces New ROK Government

LD190930 Moscow TASS in English 0813 GMT 19 Feb 88

[Text] Tokyo February 19 TASS—South Korean President-Elect No Tae-u today announced the composition of a new government.

It will be sworn in after the new head of state takes office on February 25.

In an apparent attempt to lend a "civil appearance" to his cabinet, whose main goal has been described by the authorities as "political and economic stability", No, a retired general, has included in it several representatives of the business quarters, scientists and cultural personalities.

One of them is Professor Yi Hyon-chae, former rector of Seoul University, who was appointed prime minister a week ago. At the same time, the portfolio of defence minister has been given to carrier officer O Cha-pok, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of South Korea.

The new government includes seven ministers from the previous cabinet, among them Foreign Minister Choe Kwang-su and Finance Minister Sakong Il, as another indication that it will continue the policies of the former regime.

New U.S. Military Bases in S. Korea Deplored

PM181329 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent V. Lukashin dispatch: "Pentagon Bridgehead"]

[Text] Pyongyang—Under the 1988 appropriations bill passed by the U.S. Congress, $102 million are earmarked for the construction of new military facilities in South Korea.

According to KCNA, this money will be used to expand the air bases at Kunsan, Osan, and Suwun, and the construction has begun of a new base, as well as ammunition dumps and army barracks for the personnel of the U.S. 8th Army commanded by General L. Menetrey.

The Pentagon continues to view South Korea as its main bridgehead on the continent of Asia.

The 40 military bases on its territory are U.S. outposts near the borders with the DPRK, the PRC, and the Soviet Union.

The Pentagon has deployed its nuclear weapons in South Korea.

More than 40,000 U.S. officers and men are stationed there.

The South Korean Army of more than 600,000 men, trained by U.S. advisers in the spirit of rabid anticommunism and chauvinism, has been established there.

In South Korea, right next to the DPRK, the traditional "Team Spirit" maneuvers are held every year.

Finally, the United States is persisting in its efforts to knock together a military alliance between Washington, Tokyo, and Seoul in which South Korea is seen as the Pentagon's launchpad.

Comrade Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee, called on the United States in a recent speech to turn over a new leaf in the history of Korean-U.S. relations and withdraw all nuclear weapons from South Korea. It is to be regretted that Washington remains deaf to the DPRK Government initiatives. Nothing has changed in the South.

Carlucci Report, Strategy for Japan Viewed

OW210323 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 19 Feb 88

[Dmitriyev commentary]

[Text] According to a KYODO report, U.S. Secretary of Defense Carlucci called for a large Japanese military buildup in his report presented to the Senate on 18 February. In this regard, Moscow Radio commentator Dmitriyev makes the following comments:

The Carlucci report points out that the presence of Soviet and allied military forces near areas of interest for the United States and its Pacific allies strongly requires the United States to take measures to cope with this situation. In other words, he means to say that the misfortune of U.S. allies lies in the fact that they are located near the borders of the Soviet Union and other Asian socialist countries.

However, another interpretation is possible: The U.S. allies' misfortune stems from the U.S. military's attempt to use their geographical proximity to socialist countries for strategic benefits.

For example, about 120 U.S. military bases and facilities on Japan, a country neighboring the Soviet Union, are said to have important strategic value. Moreover, F-16 fighter-bombers, which can be used for nuclear attacks against neighboring countries, are deployed at these bases. Therefore, it is nonsensical that these U.S. bases are necessary for defending Japan.

In his report, Secretary of Defense Carlucci praised Japan for earmarking $2.5 billion in its fiscal 1988 budget for increasing its share of expenses for U.S. forces in Japan. Secretary Carlucci also said that the United States could not guard its interests in Asia on its own in the face of various financial hardships, such as huge fiscal deficits.

However, Secretary Carlucci—although he is greatly concerned about his country's fiscal deficits—seems to be quite careless about Japan's fiscal deficits: he coolly asks Japan for large military increases. Also, it was just last year that Japan's defense spending topped the long-upheld 1-percent-of-GNP ceiling for the first time. The secretary made the request in the wake of this increase.

As far as Carlucci's report is concerned, the United States appears not to have abandoned its plan to turn Japan into an unsinkable aircraft carrier. Japan's military spending in the 1988 fiscal year budget increases 5.2 percent. Soviet military buildup is cited whenever Japan's militarization is called for. Actually, Soviet defense capabilities have been reduced in several areas, such as missile submarines. The Soviet Union has not increased its military exercises in both number and scale, in contrast to U.S.-Japanese joint military drills. Soviet military forces carry out their activities chiefly near the USSR. No Soviet military bases are present near U.S. coastal areas, nor do Soviet naval vessels appear on U.S. coasts.

The Soviet decision to abolish 100 warheads of the Soviet intermediate nuclear forces in the Asian part of the Soviet Union is a far from threatening act. Nevertheless, the United States has been fabricating one excuse after another to coerce Japan into militarization.

Problems in Economic Cooperation With MPR

PM151147 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Feb 88 Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent V. Sapov article under the "Cooperation" rubric: "Party Committee and Partners: Joint Search"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar—Communist leaders A. Golobokov and N. Bayarmagnay—both from "Medmolibdenstroy" [expansion unknown]—addressed themselves to the Erdenet MPRP City Committee. The former represents the Soviet side, the latter the Mongolian, but they had the same suggestion. For a long time the association had thought about creating a housing construction section in which Mongolian teams would carry out all the operations—from the foundation work to the assembly of buildings. It would therefore be possible to enhance the prestige of national cadres, who would be placed in full charge of housing construction, and the Soviet specialists thus released would reinforce teams at more complex industrial projects.

The city committee supported the suggestion and helped to equip the construction workers' camp and recruit cadres. The initiators of the suggestion were not overlooked either: The two party committees did not leave the experiment to its own devices but assigned experienced instructors. Educational work in the new collective became noticeably more vigorous with the creation of a party cell. The handover of the first multi-story blocks built entirely by their own efforts was a great red-letter day. The question of disseminating experience was discussed at a joint session of the party committees.

"What can primary organizations do in the conditions of an international collective?" B. Myanganbayar, first secretary of the MPRP City Committee, said. "We did not particularly consider this point in the past, we used traditional work methods. Each party committee acted autonomously. And even though the work was guided by the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th

MPRP Congress, the lack of coordination was appreciable. It was mainly in the spiritual sphere that efforts were pooled. Joint sessions of elected organs have become more frequent now and the material sphere has come under examination."

I have visited joint enterprises in other cities where international collectives are working. The common opinion is that it is necessary to change the style and methods of work without waiting for orders from above, to carry out your own restructuring as you go along, and to develop new forms of party influence on the deepening processes of cooperation. Until recently the "Nayramdal-Druzhba" international collectives were considered an example of the organization of competition and of educating people. This form is effective even now. But small teams are already being replaced by contract collectives and integral process teams in the mining industry, for example. Great interest has been aroused by the railroad workers' "Intensification-90" program, which envisages a package of production and social measures.

The "Erdenet" mining and enrichment combine has such a program too. The two party committees have worked hard on it and specialists from the International Research Institute of Management Problems have also contributed. At the suggestion of the MPRP City Committee, many questions of vital importance for Erdenet were mentioned in the document.

"It all depends on cadres"—that slogan is relevant to Mongolia and also goes for the developing flagship of Mongolian industry. By the end of the 5-year plan it is expected that around 20 million tonnes of ore a year will be extracted and refined in Erdenet. At the same time, shops and sections are being rebuilt and equipment updated.

The party committees' joint session raised the question of organizing a training center. Its creation has invigorated all levels of the general education system. The number of workers who have mastered combined trades have increased, schools of advanced working methods have begun operating, and the mentor system has become more active. Interest in economic knowledge has increased.

The training center's successful work could not fail to affect the enterprise's social structure. The professional level of the Mongolian specialists is being brought up to that of the Soviet specialists. The Mongolian workers' average grade is now 3.76 compared with the initial 2.07. The correlation of engineering staff has changed with the increase in the skills of local cadres: Formerly two-thirds of the combine's specialist staff were Soviet, now the figure is only one-third.

"Replacement not a goal in itself," believes P. Demchigsuren, secretary of the party committee of the mining and enrichment combine's Mongolian collective. "For the time being we cannot get by without your Belaz truck drivers, even though there are only 14 Soviet drivers out of a pool of 280, because they are all experienced mentors. There must be a limited contingent of Soviet specialists. Furthermore, we are now raising the question of their wives' being able to work in Mongolian organizations."

The family problem is not as simple as it might seem at first glance. Women's councils constantly ask the party committees of Soviet overseas institutions to provide their activists with work. Family members could work successfully in the services sphere. The country needs Russian-language teachers, music teachers, and cultural enlightenment workers. Organizations have even agreed to conclude contracts. But the Soviet side refuses even when there are free places in its construction organizations. The "women's question" still has to be resolved.

"The city is our creation," I have often heard it said at the combine. Of 12 residential districts 3 are fully devoted to serving the mining and enrichment combine, not to mention heating and power. The carpet factory has prospered. Many members of the miners' families work there. The mining and enrichment combine provides well equipped housing and kindergarten places. The schools in those districts are not overcrowded. There is a young pioneers' club, a clinic, and a sports center whose doors are open to all.

Is everything running smoothly between the partners then? No way. The city requested some money for public amenities, which was refused, but not because the resources were lacking. The administration is hedged in with instructions—just try and overcome that obstacle. Perhaps the question will be resolved this year, when the enterprise is granted greater autonomy. A problem has occurred with the construction of a movie theater and a consumer service combine.

The party committee and the partners: This theme is becoming particularly relevant as cooperation between the USSR and the socialist countries expands. A large army of Soviet specialists is at work in Mongolia, handing on their work experience to their colleagues. A new form of economic integration is emerging in which the human factor plays an ever-increasing role. For that reason work with people in the international collectives is assuming paramount importance. In that work, as in the economic sphere, much depends on the coordination of the party committees' efforts.

The Erdenet example shows that it is better to resolve questions together, of course, not by supplanting one another, and while showing the maximum tact. At Baga-Nuur there is currently a large backlog in the commissioning of schools, kindergartens, and cultural and sports facilities. The consular district's party committee is alarmed. The MPRP City Committee is worried too. But why did they not pool their efforts to intervene at the planning stage and influence the course of the new construction work on time?

The party committees have sufficient authority to do that. As an example let us cite the construction of a trolleybus route in Ulaanbaatar, whose first stage was commissioned ahead of schedule to mark the 70th anniversary of Great October. The primary party organizations of the Soviet general construction trusts showed initiative in accelerating work. The Mongolian organizations supported it. The MPRP City Committee and the revolutionary socialist youth organizations actively joined in the work and a joint construction headquarters was created. The party committee of the party organizations of the Soviet institutions in Mongolia took the construction site under special control and prevented disruptions in the supply of equipment.

A session of the party committee recently analyzed the state of affairs at the technical cooperation projects nearing completion. The picture was unfavorable. One reason cited was the insufficient party influence. A little earlier there had been an examination of the question of cooperation between elected organs within the "Mongolsovtsvetmet" Association. The conclusions were similar. The discussion revealed the weaknesses, including formalism, in organizational work at local level. For example, at a meeting of Mongolian and Soviet Communists at the Berh mine, production and everyday questions were raised keenly but not one was reflected in the decisions adopted. The ideological backup is not always adequate.

Much has been done in Mongolia with the USSR's assistance. But in the great work ahead to equalize living standards, harmonious labor by the international collectives and their party organizations is the guarantee of effective cooperation between our countries.

Near East & South Asia

Najibullah Speaks at Monument Unveiling

PM221707 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Feb 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Peaceful Sky for Afghanistan. Najibullah Speech"]

[Text] Kabul, 21 Feb—A monument to Afghan-Soviet combat friendship was unveiled in the Afghan capital today. The unveiling ceremony was attended by Najibullah, president of the Republic of Afghanistan and supreme commander in chief of the Republic's Armed Forces, as well as Afghan military leaders, generals and officers of the limited contingent of Soviet forces in Afghanistan, and members of the Kabul public.

The Afghan people will never forget the Soviet troops' fraternal assistance, Najibullah said, addressing the ensuing rally. The internationalist troops are not only helping Afghanistan to defend its independence and sovereignty but are also giving peaceful assistance to the Afghans.

The speaker stressed that Afghans regard CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's statement on Afghanistan as an outstanding political document. Now all genuine Afghan patriots must be united in the struggle for their country's peace and security. We are confident that Afghanistan's future lies in peaceful development and friendship with the USSR.

The Afghan leaders and representatives of Soviet troops laid bouquets of flowers at the monument commemorating the Afghan and Soviet troops who have fallen in battle.

Before the ceremony ended, Najibullah presented Republic of Afghanistan orders and medals to Soviet troops who have distinguished themselves in performing their international duty.

Polyakov Brings Gorbachev Message to Saudi King

LD221927 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1810 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] Amman, 22 Feb (TASS)—V.P. Polyakov, special envoy of the Soviet leadership and member of the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was received by Crown Prince 'Abdallah, deputy prime minister and commander of the Saudi National Guards, on 21 February in the Saudi capital of Riyadh. A personal message from M.S. Gorbachev to King Fahd of Saudi Arabia was prresent. The message sets forth the position of the Soviet Union on the Afghan problem, the Arab-Israeli conflict, and the Iran-Iraq war.

According to reports from Riyadh, Crown Prince 'Abdallah expressed gratitude for the message on behalf of King Fahd and said that it was an important step toward expanding the political dialogue between the leaders of the two countries. V.P. Polyakov was also received by Prince Sa'ud al-Faysal, Saudi minister of foreign affairs.

The joint opinion on the need to resolve regional conflicts through political means and through talks was stated. The sides reiterated the stances of their respective countries in favor of a peaceful settlement of the situation in and around Afghanistan, of the speediest possible convocation of an international conference on the Middle East, and of ending the Iran-Iraq war through implementing UN Security Council Resolution 598.

U.S. 'Diplomatic Offensive' on Mideast Condemned

LD231410 Moscow TASS in English 1218 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 23 TASS—By TASS commentator Yuriy Alekseyev:

The current U.S. massive diplomatic offensive in the Middle East is aimed at galvanizing the Camp David process of separate deals, which is the strategic objective of U.S. policy in the region.

That was the political aim of the missions of Philip Habib, Richard Murphy and Michael Armacost. They were trying, on the one hand, to reassure the Arab world in connection with the unseemly behavior of the USA at the Security Council, which vetoed the resolution demanding that Israel put an end to terror and repressions in the occupied territories, on the other hand,—to help Israel get out of the impasse by means of a plan inadequate to the times, disregarding the fundamental principle of reckoning with the interests of all sides involved in the conflict.

The stake made by Washington on "intermediate steps" hardly helps towards a radical improvement of the situation in the Middle East. This has made it possible to bring down the temperature, but not cure the disease itself. Intermediate solutions can produce results only in the general context of settlement within the framework of an all-embracing approach to that problem.

The only possible formula for the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict is an international conference on the Middle East under the U.N. Auspices with the participation of the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council and the Palestine Liberation Organization. This is the principled stand of the Soviet Union, which is shared by all the Arab states, the Palestinian movements, an overwhelming majority of the countries of the world.

'Arafat Speaks to UN Human Rights Commission

PM230939 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Feb 88 Morning Edition p4

[Own correspondent Yu. Kosinskiy dispatch under the rubric "Facts, Events, Opinions": "Yasir 'Arafat Lays the Blame"]

[Text] Geneva—Many people were aware of Yasir 'Arafat's arrival in Geneva for the UN Human Rights Commission session. However, for security reasons, the time of his speech was kept secret.

So when the leader of the PLO unexpectedly entered the crowded hall of the Palais des Nations, the session participants greeted him with loud applause. But the members of the U.S. delegation got up and pointedly left the hall.

"Precisely at a time when the international community is preparing to celebrate this year's 40th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Israel is denying the Palestinian people their legal right to live in the land of their fathers and forefathers," the chairman of the PLO Executive Committee said in his speech to delegates at the Human Rights Commission session. Y. 'Arafat drew delegates' attention to the fact that some 60 percent of Palestinians have already been driven out or forcibly deported from their native country, while the remaining 40 percent are living under the conditions imposed by the occupying regime.

"Our people have responded to the mass murders and reprisals carried out by the Israeli security forces and the Israeli army and to the attacks by nationalist groups reminiscent of Nazi crimes in terms of their scale and savagery by rising up against the occupying regime," 'Arafat said. "This uprising is being cruelly suppressed: In the last 74 days, 120 people have been killed, more than 3,000 wounded, and more than 7,000 driven into so-called centers for detainees. The Israeli authorities are trying to bring the Palestinian people to their knees by denying them the right to their native country and to life itself. The policy of murder and massive repression against the Palestinians is encouraged by the United States," Y. 'Arafat stressed.

In order to suppress the Palestinian movement, Israel has used highly dangerous, U.S.-manufactured gases and a considerable amount of weapons and combat equipment produced in the United States this year. Speaking in this same hall several days before, the PLO leader reminded delegates, the American representative had spoken out in favor of guaranteeing human rights for all peoples, although he evidently forgot to mention the rights of Palestinians. If the United States did not support its allies and accomplices in Tel Aviv on a military, economic, and financial level, Israel could not continue to violate international agreements and resolutions with such impunity. Resorting to the use of the "veto" in the United Nations, which is clearly contrary to the mood and will of the majority of the international community, the United States is using human rights solely for propaganda purposes.

Y. 'Arafat sharply condemned the fact that the United States is undermining the community's efforts to prepare an international conference to settle the Near East situation. As long as there are people on this earth deprived of the right to freedom, peace cannot be reliably guaranteed, the PLO leader said, emphasizing the need to reach a settlement of the Palestinian problem as soon as possible. He also urged Iran and Iraq to end their exhausting war.

The PLO gives the utmost support to the treaty concluded by M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan to reduce intermediate-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles, as it is the beginning of an encouraging process of achieving peace in a world free of nuclear arsenals, Y. 'Arafat stressed in conclusion. The achievement of positive results in the human rights sphere, he noted, will without a doubt further the development and strengthening of security, peace, and justice.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Nigerian President Receives Gorbachev Message
LD222001 Moscow TASS in English 1552 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] Lagos February 22 TASS—Nigeria welcomes and highly appraises the efforts of Mikhail Gorbachev and the entire Soviet people to consolidate peace on earth, Nigeria's president, General Ibrahim Babangida said today after a verbal message on Afghanistan from the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee has been conveyed to him.

Nigeria supports the present steps toward achieving peace in Afghanistan, said the head of state. He said the Nigerian side will analyse the message of the Soviet leader and will take appropriate measures to promote the peace process.

Nigerian-Soviet relations existing for 27 years are very good, Ibrahim Babangida said. The USSR rendered Nigeria significant support when there was a civil war in Nigeria and promoted the preservation of the nation's unity. The President declared for the furtner consolidation of Nigerian-Soviet cooperation in every area, also in the international arena.

Mikhail Gorbachev's message on Afghanistan was conveyed to the Nigerian president by special representative of the Soviet leader, Ambassador at Large Vyacheslav Ustinov who had arrived in Lagos.

Briefs:

Ambassador to the Gambia

Gambia cherishes friendly relations with the USSR and seeks broader bilateral contacts. This has been said in Banjul by the president of the country, Dawda Jawara, when he received the credentials from the Soviet ambassador, Papkin. He said the Gambia is eager to promote cooperation with the Soviet Union on the basis of friendship, mutual interest, and benefit. He spoke highly of Soviet efforts to settle regional conflicts by peaceful means. [Text] [*Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 20 Feb 88 LD*]

Aid to Ethiopia

A gift from the Union of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies of the USSR to the population of drought-stricken Ethiopia has been delivered to Addis Ababa today by a special Aeroflot aircraft. It includes 2 tonnes of medicine, 10 tonnes of food concentrates, and 1 tonne of baby food. This is not the first time that the USSR has taken part in eliminating the consequences of elemental disasters in Ethiopia. [Text] [*Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 19 Feb 88 LD*]

East Europe

Yakovlev Sees Off Gromyko for Hungarian Visit
LD230848 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Comrade Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, left Moscow today for Budapest on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party and the Presidium of the Hungarian People's Republic. He was seen off at the airport by Comrade Yakovlev, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, and other officials.

Further on Departure
LD231033 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0923 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, 23 Feb (TASS)—A.A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, left Moscow today for Budapest on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the MSZMP Central Committee and the Presidium of the Hungarian People's Republic. The following officials accompanied him: A.K. Antonov, USSR Council of Ministers first deputy chairman; A.E. Voss, USSR Supreme Soviet Council of Nationalities chairman; V.P. Loginov, deputy USSR foreign minister; Ye.M. Primakov, director of the World Economics and International Relations Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and V.V. Karpov, first secretary of the board of the USSR Union of Writers.

A.A. Gromyko was accompanied to the airport by A.N. Yakovlev, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary; S.B. Tatliyev, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium deputy chairman; T.N. Menteshashvili, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium secretary; Yu. M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister; and other officials.

Among those at the airport was J. Barabas, charge d'affaires of the Hungarian People's Republic in the USSR.

Nemeth Meets Gromyko
LD231218 Moscow TASS in English 1207 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Budapest February 23 TASS—Andrey Gromyko, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, arrived here today on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party (HSWP) and the Presidential Council of the Hungarian People's Republic.

He was welcomed at the airport by Karoly Nemeth, a member of the Political Bureau of the HSWP Central Committee and president of the Presidential Council of Hungary, and other officials.

Hungarian Reportage

For Hungarian media coverage of the visit by Andrey Gromyko, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, see the Hungary section of the 23 February East Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Hungary's Marjai Views Treaty Anniversary

PM221135 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Feb 88 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Jozsef Marjai, Hungarian Council of Ministers deputy chairman: "In Fraternal Alliance; 18 February is 40th Anniversary of the Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance Between the USSR and Hungary"]

[Text] Budapest—The leadership of our party and state and our people assess the Soviet-Hungarian Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance signed 40 years ago as a decisive document in Hungary's destiny. It has become one of the pillars on which national sovereignty rests and deepens and on which our international positions are being consolidated. In its time the treaty opened the way to the elimination of the consequences of war, the reorganization of the economy, and socialist development. It created a foundation for the current cooperation between our two countries.

Thanks to this collaboration Hungary has become a country with a developed industry and modern agriculture. Whereas before the war Hungary played a limited role in the international economic community, as a result of the economic growth accelerated in 1948, and subsequently thanks to the processes of the integration of the CEMA countries, it became a country with an open economy with business ties with all the most important regions of the world. Whereas in 1945 our turnover with the Soviet Union scarcely reached R60 million, in 1987 its total cost was R10 billion. That is one-third of all Hungarian foreign trade turnover. In previous decades the USSR has played a decisive part in creating our heavy and light industry, machine building, the petroleum extracting and chemical industry, energy, and other sectors.

On the other hand, the USSR is the largest market for Hungarian goods: We send it nearly half of all our exports of machine building items and nearly 40 percent of our agricultural produce exports. For the Soviet Union we are the fifth most important trading partner and we have a share of over 7 percent in its total turnover.

Over these 40 years the republic's government—partly within the framework of cooperation in CEMA and partly bilaterally—has constantly kept track of the state of the economic relations system. We have concluded many treaties aimed at ensuring that cooperation in the field of the economy, trade, science, and technology increasingly promotes the satisfaction of the demands made on our countries' national economies. These agreements have expanded sharing and specialization and promoted the intensification of economic ties and integration.

Soviet-Hungarian cooperation has been embodied in important industrial enterprises like the Paks atomic power station, two oxygen conversion shops and a coking battery in Dunaujvaros, a cement plant in Belapatfalva, oil refineries in Sazkhalmonbatt [name as published] and Leninvaros, and many others. Scientific and technical ties are being activated. Approximately 200 Hungarian and 400 Soviet institutes and enterprises are cooperating in implementing the projected tasks. The number of joint scientific operations successfully completed in recent years totals over 400. Specialists have created and are continuing to create new technologies, machinery, instruments, and materials.

In accordance with its potential Hungary has joined in the implementation of the particularly important development programs facing the Soviet national economy. For instance, we are taking part in the fulfillment of the Food Program and in the modernization of a number of plants of the light and machine building industries.

In celebrating an important anniversary today, when we pay tribute to undoubtedly positive results, we must not forget the new tasks constantly being set by the changing outside world. We must comply with the development of the world economy and work in a more coordinated way, side by side. It is no accident that both the Soviet Union and Hungary are now living through a period characterized by the new formulation of the aims and methods of economic management and their renewal in accordance with today and tomorrow.

We have repeatedly stressed that our party and the Hungarian people wholeheartedly welcomed and continue to welcome restructuring and the broad revolutionary process of transformations under way in the Soviet Union. Hungary is very closely linked with this process in international affairs and in economic building.

Under the leadership of the MSZMP many reforms have been carried out in the republic serving the goals of the economy's renewal. The use of elements of market motivation, for instance, has led to the boosting of industry's export potential and the enhancement of its efficiency. There ceased to be a shortage of the most important foodstuffs. The economic reform has justified itself. The tension which has arisen recently did not occur because we carried out this reform. On the contrary, we did not, unfortunately, always consistently follow the path we had chosen. The improvement of our economic mechanism and the introduction of a new tax system are now continuing. We are engaging in the reform of the banks, wages, and prices. While increasing enterprises' autonomy (they have now acquired a greater opportunity for access to the foreign market), we are at the same time not reducing the leading, organizing role of the socialist state.

The MSZMP Central Committee and then the Hungarian State Assembly have elaborated and adopted a program for stabilization and for emerging from the difficult situation. Hungary was powerfully shaken by the changes which have taken place in the world economy. But we have also sometimes wrongly appraised our potential and have been slow to increase the profitability of our output and allocated a large quantity of funds for the maintenance of unprofitable production. A considerable proportion of these expenses were covered by foreign loans. Now, in increasing our competitiveness and efficiency, we want to gradually pay off our debts and at the same time ensure new sources of development.

Several other socialist countries are now also encountering similar economic concerns and the transition to the intensive path of development. We must seek new paths together. That is why there is a great need to ensure that, alongside the domestic restructuring of the economy, we also renew the mechanism of socialist economic cooperation within the CEMA framework, as was discussed at the CEMA session in Moscow in October 1987. There is full agreement between the Soviet and Hungarian Government and party leadership that, without waiting for the reform of CEMA, which is being coordinated on a multilateral basis, we will in our bilateral relations (where possible) march forward along the path of reconstructing and modernizing the cooperation mechanism. We are sure this will also exert positive influence on the development of the multilateral economic integration process. In the past 2 years we have had particularly important talks on the subject with the Soviet party and state leaders. As always on the Soviet side we met with a readiness to help us and the desire for cooperation.

Intensive work is now under way in the interests of implementing the agreements reached between the two sides. Both at interstate level and in the sphere of enterprises. The paramount task is to fulfill mutual deliveries to a volume of R50 billion scheduled for the current 5-year plan to a high standard and on time. We are interested in ensuring that the disproportions now arising because of prices for energy sources be eliminated as rapidly as possible, which will make it possible to ensure the equilibrium of the balance of payments between our countries in accordance with the fundamental agreements formulated at meetings between the leaders of our parties and states. The Hungarian foreign trade organizations and industrial enterprises should take an active part in this. We are obliging them to acquaint themselves better with the Soviet Union's further potential for supplies, particularly of modern machinery and equipment.

Direct relations between our enterprises have a positive influence on the two countries' foreign trade turnover. Some 120 pairs of Hungarian and Soviet enterprises have concluded contracts on direct ties. The experience being accumulated in this field is already proving this direct cooperation promotes the punctilious fulfillment of commitments enshrined in intergovernment agreements, the updating of the range of output, and an increase in production efficiency. The Hungarian-Soviet joint enterprises which have started to operate are also raising us to a higher, qualitatively new degree of cooperation. There are already about 10 of these enterprises. Expanding the autonomy of joint enterprises so that they can "throw" stable bridges between our economic mechanisms—that, as I see it, is a topical task of ours.

We are now working intensively on the elaboration of the further prospects of joint cooperation. In the immediate future we will begin the coordination of our national economic plans for 1991-1995. The elaboration of a concept for Hungarian-Soviet economic and scientific-technical collaboration for 15-20 years is also under way.

Hungarian-Soviet economic cooperation today comes within the implementation of our program for stabilization and provides a support for Hungary's broader inclusion in the international division of labor. As has been the case so far, so in the future this cooperation will also remain one of the most important factors in attaining our economic and social goals.

Hungary's Kadar Greets Moscow Radio Club

LD200813 Moscow International Service in Hungarian 2000 GMT 19 Feb 88

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] This week the PAPA club of Moscow Radio friends were greeted by Comrade Janos Kadar. The message, which was carried by the county Veszprem paper NAPLO, was read to me over the phone. The message stresses: Esteemed comrades, taking advantage of the opportunity, I would like to express my recognition of the activity which you are carrying out for the deepening of friendship between the Hungarian and Soviet peoples. I heartily congratulate you for having been placed first in the country. I wish you all the best; I wish you strength, health, and many more successes to the leadership and every member of the Moscow Radio Friendship Club. With cordial greetings, Janos Kadar.

CPSU Delegation Meets With LCY Aides

PM221657 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Feb 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Delegation Trip"]

[Text] In line with the schedule for links between the CPSU and LCY, a CPSU party workers delegation headed by V.G. Kibirev, Krasnodar CPSU Kraykom second secretary, was in Yugoslavia 16 through 21 February to acquaint itself with LCY experience in organizing political training and with the forms and methods of the LCY's work with the media. It had meetings and conversations at the LCY Central Committee, the Vojvodina League of Communists Provincial Committee, a number of newspaper editorial offices, radio and television organizations, Marxist centers, and the political department of Belgrade University. The delegation was received by F. Setinc, LCY Central Committee Presidium member, and B. Muzevic, LCY Central Committee Presidium executive secretary.

Orzechowski Stops Over En Route to India

LD221430 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1230 GMT 22 Feb 88

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Orzechowski, PZPR Central Committee Politburo member and the Polish People's Republic foreign affairs minister, today made a short stopover in Moscow on his way to India, Thailand, and Malaysia.

Self-Management Bodies Hold Warsaw Conference

PM221715 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Feb 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Workers Councils' Tasks"]

[Text] Warsaw, 21 Feb—A conference of representatives of Polish labor collectives' workers self-management bodies has been held on the state and prospects of the development of workers self-management in Poland and its tasks in the process of implementing the second stage of the economic reform.

The conference was addressed by W. Jaruzelski, PZPR Central Committee first secretary and Polish State Council chairman. The self-management bodies' work experience demonstrates, the speaker said, that it is no longer an experiment but proven practice. We will continue to strengthen the positions and enhance the prestige of workers self-management bodies.

As the conference debate demonstrated, W. Jaruzelski continued, there is still a whole series of shortcomings in the activity of workers self-management bodies. There is a multitude of reserves at each enterprise and in the economy as a whole.

Zhivkov Holds Talks With Greece's Papandreou

LD231027 Moscow TASS in English 0941 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Sofia February 23 TASS—At their meeting in Sofia Todor Zhivkov, president of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, and Andreas Papandreou, prime minister of Greece, now here on a friendly working visit, have expressed decisive support for the Soviet-U.S. treaty on eliminating intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles.

They emphasized that the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, which had been envigorated following the meeting between the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mihail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, was an historic fact of enormous significance. It opens up the possibility of solving mankind's overriding problem—building a weapons-free and non-violent world.

Simultaneously, the sides drew attention to the existence of the forces in the West, which are bent on neutralizing this success. They make attempts to subvert the negotiations on disarmament issues, force the idea of "compensatory" measures as a follow-on to the destruction of two classes of nuclear missiles, and generate tension in northern and southern Europe. Shortsightendness, which can bring about an all-human tragedy, should not be displayed in this critical time, the parties in the talks noted.

The Bulgarian leader welcomed the recent statements by Mikhail Gorbachev and Najibullah on Afghanistan. He pointed out that the decision on the specific time-frame for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from that country, announced by the Governments of the USSR and the Republic of Afghanistan, created the necessary preconditons for a final solution of the Afghan problem in the near term.

During the talks special attention was paid to the upcoming meeting of the foreign ministers of the Balkan countries in Belgrade. From the Bulgarian side it was stated that the People's Republic of Bulgaria would do everything for this meeting to be a success. It should discuss issues affecting all Balkan countries. We do not play down the disagreements and difficulties existing among separate countries of the peninsula. But they should be examined and ironed out both on the bilateral and multilateral basis in the spirit of the new realities in the world, Todor Zhivkov said.

The Greek premier emphasized that the two countries held similar positions on these matters. He expressed the wish that the meeting of the foreign ministers of the Balkan countries become traditional and held once in very two years. And once indispensable conditions are created, a top-level Balkan meeting should be convened, he said.

Bulgarian Trade Union Delegation Visits

PM230952 Moscow TRUD in Russian 21 Feb 88 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Delegation's Visit"]

[Text] A delegation of the Bulgarian Central Council of Trade Unions headed by Secretary A. Traykov was in the Soviet Union 15 through 20 December.

The delegation visited Moscow and Leningrad, talked with AUCCTU secretaries V.P. Provotorov and V.N. Makeyev, and visited educational and scientific institutions of the Soviet trade unions, the Leningrad Oblast Trade Unions Council, and the Lenpodyemtransmash Association. Questions of improving the practical activity of the trade unions in the conditions of restructuring and ways to further widen and deepen cooperation between the trade unions of the USSR and Bulgaria were examined and discussed.

The delegation was received by AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev on 19 February.

Political & Social

Comparison of Gorbachev Plenum Speech

Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1900 GMT on 18 February carries the announcer-read speech by CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev at the CPSU Central Committee plenum on 18 February. The Moscow Domestic Russian version has been compared with the Moscow PRAVDA Russian version published in the 19 February Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pp 42-59, and found to contain the following variations:

Page 50, column one, paragraph two, from last sentence radio version reads ...will go wrong. [new paragraph] Because not everything... (omitting sentence)

Column two, paragraph three, fourth sentence radio version reads ...This is the paramount problem, which again directly... (substituting for phrase "This is the way to solve social problems as quickly as possible")

Page 52, column one, paragraph three, tenth sentence radio version reads ...plan period by 18.2 percent and labor... (substituting "18.2" for "18")

Column two, last paragraph, last sentence radio version reads ...RSFSR, particularly Gorkiy, Volgograd, Novosibirsk, Penza, Ryazan... (adding "Volgograd")

Page 57, column two, paragraph two, third sentence, radio version reads ...will never become "good." [new paragraph] The central link... (omitting sentence)

Zaykov Visits Moscow's Cheremushkinskiy Rayon

LD302302 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 30 Jan 88

[Text] Comrade Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom, visited the capital's Cheremushkinskiy Rayon today. Comrade Kuznetsov, first secretary of the Raykom, related the course of constructing social, cultural, and community facilities and the situation in the spheres of housing construction, health care, trade, and public catering.

Last year a whole series of new construction projects were commissioned in Cheremushkinskiy rayon but, according to many indices, it has not yet been possible to reach the existing standards. At a conference in the automation and instrument-making scientific production association, there was an examination of questions linked to the transfer to full financial autonomy, the coming into force of the law on the state enterprise association and improving the structure of production control. Particular attention was paid to the intensive practical introduction of the achievements of scientific and technological progress and to strengthening the experimental base of research and design developments. Comrade Zaykov was acquainted with the working and living conditions of the collective, the prospects for development in social sphere, and the tackling of the most important task—the provision of each family with a separate apartment.

During a visit to the Meridian Palace of Culture, there was a conversation with the staff and participants in amateur collectives, circles, and clubs for children and adults, on the problems of mass cultural work with the population. It was noted that it is essential to make maximum use of the very rich reserves that exist in Moscow and to make the capital a city of advanced daily life and developed culture.

Deputy Minister Voronin Awarded Order of Lenin

LD211318 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 21 Feb 88

[Text] The Order of Lenin has been awarded by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to L.A. Voronin, deputy minister of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, for his services to the Soviet state and in connection with his 60th birthday.

Koksanov Named Shipbuilding Industry Minister

LD201440 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1410 GMT 20 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow, 20 Feb (TASS)—The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Igor Koksanov as USSR minister of the shipbuilding industry.

Igor Koksanov was born on 23 February 1928 in the town of Perm. He is Russian. In 1951 he graduated from the Leningrad Shipbuilding Institute. Until 1961 he served in the Navy and then became assistant chief ship designer in a design office and deputy head of a main administration in the USSR Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry.

In 1973 he was promoted to work in the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee as a section head. Since 1985 he has been first deputy minister of the shipbuilding industry.

Latvian Founder of 'Helsinki-86' To Leave

LD191942 Moscow TASS in English 1854 GMT 19 Feb 88

[Text] Riga February 19 TASS—Correspondent Lyudmila Shvartz writes:

Linards Grantyns, the founder of the so-called "Helsinki-86" human rights group in Latvia, has decided to leave the USSR. The TASS correspondent learned this at the Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs today.

The attempts of this organisation to provoke anti-Soviet actions, to distribute slogans and leaflets of a nationalistic content failed to win support in the republic. And this is evidenced also by the total failure of this group's calls for anti-Soviet demonstrations in Latvia last summer and autumn.

On suffering a fiasco virtually all founders of the group have already left the republic. The TASS correspondent learned at the Latvian foreign ministry that Edmund Cirvilis, convicted way back in 1945 for the organisation of terrorist acts, and Janis Barkans, who also has several convictions, have left the USSR. The list of "human rights activists" who have left the country also includes Janis Rojkalns and Raimond Bitenieks, who have a criminal record. Now they are trying to join the overseas chapter of "Helsinki-86" in which they were eagerly awaited by the secretary of the so-called Latvian Embassy in Washington John Lusis. It was stressed at the Latvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs that the so-called embassy exists solely on CIA money.

It was precisely from Washington that news was circulated about the appearance of a new representative of Latvian "human rights activists"—Juris Vidins, a 50-year-old physician. For more than ten years he was known in the Latvian town of Resekne not only as the chief physician of a hospital but also as a quarrelsome person. His reputation was tarnished by abuse of alcohol and serious violations of financial regulations. So on being made to leave his post of chief physician Vidins decided to assert himself morally as a member of the "Helsinki-86" group which was almost defunct by then.

"Vidins tries to present nationalistic declarations under the guise of ideas of perestroyka, democratisation and glasnost that are so popular in the USSR now", the TASS correspondent was told by Latvia's Foreign Minsiter Leonard Bartkevics. He said that there were more than 2,500 informal associations in Latvia now although its population is only about three million. Common interests have united sociologists and nature lovers, musicians and collectioners.

"Such processes in Latvia, just as throughout the USSR, reflect the striving of people to be socially active. But the programme of the 'Helsinki-86' group, which has failed, is quite another thing. Its hostile attitude to the Soviet system of government and intolerance of other nations and ethnic groups contradict the constitution of Latvia, in particular its Article 37 which says that 'the exercise by citizens of their rights and freedoms should not inflict damage to the interests of society and the state, to the rights of other citizens'. The attempts by Vidins to camouflage anti-Soviet slogans in the guise of perestroyka will not deceive the public", Leonard Bartkevics stressed. "For he allied himself not with the people of Latvia but with the Free Europe and Voice of America radio stations".

More on Gromyko Address to Lithuanian Officials

PM221201 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 6 Feb 88 pp 1,2

[Unattributed report: "Soviets Must Hold Key Positions in Restructuring. Speech by A.A. Gromyko" at conference of senior soviet organ officials and members of the party-economic aktiv of Lithuania in Vilnius on 5 February 1988]

[Text] Dear comrades!

It gives me great satisfaction to participate in this forum of the republic's party and soviet aktiv.

What is our discussion about today, if we go by the content and tone of speeches? The subject is simple and understandable. There is a need—and you yourselves feel this—to speak about certain problems facing the republic in all their magnitude. As a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, I would like to receive, as people say, first-hand information about the state of affairs in your republic; and of course, for my part, to express certain ideas on behalf of the leadership.

Our conversation must be a party-minded one and nothing else. The successes—let us call them successes. The shortcomings and perhaps even hitches in certain sectors of life in the republic, let us call them just that—shortcomings and hitches. This would be the right thing to do.

The purpose of our conversation is obvious—to find paths and approaches to improve the situation. In addition, it has long been known that it is possible to turn even something good into something still better.

At such forums you usually expect—and I hope that you will understand me correctly—everyone to say what is the actual state of affairs and candidly share their thoughts.

This is what I would like to see at your aktiv. I think it is taking place in just this spirit, already drawing to a close.

People have gathered here who worthily head one of our union republics. I convey to you all very best wishes that you confidently stand on watch, ensuring the cause of great restructuring in the republic's economic, social, and spiritual life. The entire country and the entire Soviet people are now living for this. (Applause)

The process of restructuring is irreversible, comrades, we all must realize this. All of us collectively and each one of us individually: It is irreversible. There is and will be no deviation here. Its chief aims are the achievement of accelerated, dynamic economic development, positive and decisive changes in the social sphere, and the deepening of democratization in all aspects of the life of society.

Your republic is preparing to celebrate a great anniversary—the 70th anniversary of the formation of the Communist Party and the establishment of Soviet power in Lithuania in fighting 1918. The power of the soviets was reestablished by the Lithuanian people in 1940. It is now stronger than ever. Perhaps there are lunatics somewhere abroad who do not understand this. Well, life will help to cure them.

Under socialist conditions, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev rightly pointed out during his stay in the Soviet Baltic republics, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have pooled their material and spiritual resources with the other union republics. They have been able to rely on the tremendous potential of our entire country's national economic complex.

Thousands of threads of economic ties extend from Lithuanian soil to the remotest corners of the union. Cotton, motor vehicles, tractors, coal, and oil come to you. Working Lithuania in turn sends precision machine tools, electric motors, instruments, consumer goods, and agricultural produce to very different destinations. This is a natural process under conditions of a socialist state.

Restructuring is making great strides across the country, millions of working people have actively joined in it, and it is part and parcel of every labor collective and every Soviet person.

The party is mobilizing all forces to fulfill the tasks at the present, decisive stage of restructuring. The organs of people's power—the soviets—must hold the key positions here. I wish to dwell particularly on this question.

What is characteristic of the soviets' activity today? Of course, the process of activating and improving their work is taking place, their ability to work is growing, and their impact on all spheres of life is growing. All this is true. This is noticeable. It cannot be denied. The soviets have every opportunity for this. In your republic too, there are experienced, skilled cadres and, most importantly, the population's active support.

But, comrades, justice requires us to admit that they have done far from everything that the party and the people demand. The soviets have not everywhere become genuine, solicitous masters, and their activity still accords far from fully with the demands of profound transformations in the life of society.

In carrying out the cardinal reform of the economy, it must be remembered that the unity of the regions' social and economic development is one of the chief principles toward which the party orients the people. It objectively stems primarily from the unity of interests of the labor collectives of enterprises and organizations located on the soviet's territory and of the inhabitants of villages, settlements, and cities.

What is the thrust of these interests? It is to create the kind of production and social structure and the kind of organization of housing and municipal services, trade, public catering, health care, and consumer services which would ensure high production indicators and, at the same time, the most favorable working and living conditions for people. In other words, to ensure that Soviet man can work and live better in our land.

The party Central Committee and USSR Government resolution "On Improving the Activity of Republican Management Organs" must be constantly in their field of vision. This also applies without question to your republic.

The first results of restructuring and of work under the new conditions which we see in the Lithuanian SSR, let us state frankly, are quite good. During the first 2 years of the 5-year plan the increase in the volume of industrial output stood at more than 10 percent, and 11 percent for agricultural output. Much has also been done to develop the social sphere. This has to be admitted.

All this is the result of the labor and the skilled organizational work of party and soviet organs. You also have front-rankers working successfully under conditions of economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet] and self-financing. They are known not only in your own republic but also in Moscow.

One could list among them the "Drobe" Wool Production Association in Kaunas, Lithuania's "Sigma" Production Association, and the "Baltiya" Shipyard in Klaypeda. Good indicators have been achieved by Ionavskiy Rayon's "Zheymyay" Kolkhoz, Shakyayskiy Rayon's "Tayka" Kolkhoz, Kedaynskiy Rayon's "Pashushvis" Kolkhoz, and a number of other plants, sovkhozes, and kolkhozes.

Impressive results have also been achieved by the labor collectives of the "Vilnyus" Furniture Combine and the hothouse combine, where I was briefed on production processes and to a certain extent on the working and living conditions, and where I conversed with people. Some highly instructive examples of advanced experience by many collectives are on display at the Lithuanian SSR Exhibition of National Economic Achievements which I visited.

Why have positive results been achieved in these collectives? The answer is clear—initiative, hard work, the use of progressive management methods, and, of course, attention to social, everyday questions or, to put it more simply, to the working person.

The latter is particularly important. Can a working person work most efficiently with a machine tool if he has bad housing, if his child is not in a creche or kindergarten and is left unminded, if trade and consumer services are poorly developed? No, all this will naturally hinder work. I am sure that each one of you, whenever you are among people, stresses this idea with perfect justification.

On the other hand, where will the money be found to construct housing, kindergartens, hospitals, schools, clubs, and stores if enterprises do not work efficiently? If a sufficient number of good-quality commodities that satisfy the population's needs do not appear on the store counters? If funds are not earned to develop the social sphere? Where will these come from? We are only at the start of the road here.

The new thinking which is spreading increasingly widely among workers, kolkhoz members, specialists, and leaders of party and soviet organs leads to the conclusion that only the comprehensive development of the social and production spheres will make it possible to achieve high results. There will be no manna descending from heaven. Labor is the source of all benefits. The economy is a complex sphere. To rely on the economy alone to the exclusion of all else is not the way to achieve success. It is not what the people expect. This would seem to be an obvious truth. In practice, however, it is not always taken into account or used as a guideline.

The republic does offer examples of successful comprehensive work. It is worth giving attention to and disseminating the experience in cooperation between the Elektrenay Settlement Soviet and the labor collective from Lithuania's V.I. Lenin GRES on the comprehensive social development and urbanization of the settlement. More than 15,000 residents, mainly workers at the electric power station, enjoy the facilities of a trade center, a consumer services combine, dining rooms, a dispensary, a hospital, a polyclinic, a House of Culture, a general education school and a music school, a children's combine, a Young Pioneers' camp which operates all the year round, and a sports facilities complex. This shows what can be achieved by using comprehensive development. But this is not, of course, the upper limit, either. There is still much that you can do.

The Law on the State Enterprise came into effect in January. The law is designed to help increase production, opens up broad scope for showing initiative and healthy socialist enterprise, and extends the powers of labor collectives.

But it is necessary to look the truth in the eyes: Difficulties have arisen in implementing the law, and more will emerge. Not all of the republic's enterprises are ready to work under the new conditions. You perhaps know this better than I do. Let us look at output delivery plans: 14 of your enterprises (3.9 percent) failed to fulfill them, 27 enterprises failed to cope with the targets for increasing labor productivity, and 22 lagged behind in consumer goods production. These figures do mean something for the republic, and they mean a great deal.

It will not be easy for these plants and factories to work under conditions of self-capitalization, and workers and engineers could find themselves dissatisfied. Measures must be taken to rectify the situation, and without delay. There are grounds for believing that your republic has sufficient potential to rectify the situation. This potential exists!

Now a few words about the fulfillment of the Food Program and the role of soviets in this work. There has been some improvement. The leadership of the agro-industrial complex has become more down to earth, and there is greater interest in the end results of labor.

Under unfavorable weather conditions last year the republic succeeded in growing and reaping a bumper harvest of more than 32 quintals of grain crops per hectare. This is a good amount! Farms in the republic increased the production and sales to the state of meat, milk, and eggs. Positive development was also achieved in feed procurement.

However, the tasks concerning the development of the food base are far from resolved, and there are no grounds for complacency. This concerns both your republic and the country as a whole. This is, unfortunately, true.

The social thrust of our entire national economy is increasingly being stepped up. The average annual commissioning of housing in the country as a whole has increased 9 percent. The plans of the party and the state to provide every family with a separate apartment or house by the year 2000 are well known. It is no secret that this can be done only through great, strenuous labor. But it must be done. It would be nice if the republic were to rank among the first in housing construction. The opinion in the center is that the republic does have potential. In any case, it ought to be among the leaders.

At least 9 million square meters of housing must be constructed in Lithuania alone during the 5-year plan. The volumes of housing construction really are growing, but not in the way necessary to fulfill the plans.

Storm tactics are still used. This is altogether a poor ally—storm tactics are an unreliable ally. Here is one of last year's indicators: One-third of the planned housing was commissioned during the last 6 weeks alone. It is also noteworthy that the pace of housing construction in the countryside has slowed down. This certainly ought not to happen.

What is the conclusion to be drawn? It is necessary, as the saying goes, to do some more work. This is the only reliable way. Questions of housing must constantly be the center of attention of soviets and all economic organizations, they must be subject to unremitting influence and monitoring by the soviets.

In all fairness it must be noted that road construction is being carried out on a large scale. The republic ranks among the leaders in the country in terms of the density of its network of roads and bus routes. This is good. A great achievement. It is, however, unlikely that anyone would claim that the limits have been reached. I have not heard any such claims being made.

The population is very concerned at the still low quality of consumer goods. The plans for their production are, in the main, I repeat, in the main, being fulfilled, but you will not always find what is in demand. Meanwhile, slow-moving and unmarketable goods worth almost R9 million have accumulated in warehouses. This is quite a large amount for your republic.

Serious complaints are being made about output manufactured by the "Nyamunas" Factory and the "Lyaliya" Association, and about the quality of "Elfa" tape recorders, television sets manufactured in Shyaulyay, and the "Vayras" Plant's bicycles.

The question is: How do you intend to fulfill your "Kachestvo [quality]-90" Program which envisages almost doubling the output of top-quality products in the 12th 5-Year Plan period?

Soviets evidently do not properly monitor the manufacture of consumer goods, including their quality, and the people's control is inadequate. There may even be some other reasons—this cannot be ruled out. But these are the ones that immediately come to mind. And where is the state acceptance system and its role? The ultimate result is unsatisfied demand.

The imbalance between commodity resources and the planned development of retail commodity turnover and the growth of consumer potential remains one of the chief problems of soviets, of economic organs, and of the republican leadership as a whole.

Lithuania has long been renowned for its crafts and skilled folk craftsmen. New opportunities have now emerged for developing individual labor activity and joining together in cooperatives. More than 28,000 persons are already working in these spheres, with 695 cooperatives already registered. It is still early to speak of results; all of the work is still to be done. But when will this work be properly launched? It was no accident that in the course of our conference we heard people ask when it will be properly launched.

The soviets must be a bit more active here. After all, 27 percent of the registered cooperatives have still not begun working at all—they are not being given premises or being helped with raw materials and semimanufactures. This is a bad sign. The law has been adopted, but no help is available for members of cooperatives. The potential for developing services like repairs to housing, domestic appliances, furniture, footwear, and clothing is not fully utilized.

Now let us look at problems of nature conservation. These occupied a due place at our conference. A resolution on the radical restructuring of nature conservation work was adopted quite recently by the CPSU Central Committee and the country's Council of Ministers. This is a very important sphere in the soviets' activity, including soviets in your republic. Soviets have not yet shown themselves to be proper stewards displaying concern for the destinies and the health of people, including future generations. Many decisions on ceasing disposal of untreated effluents into rivers and other water sources in the Baltic Basin are not being fulfilled. Purification installations, particularly in rural localities, do not work efficiently enough or are totally inoperative. This is altogether worse than bad—totally inoperative. Soviets cannot remain idle on this issue. Who else is there to really tackle the question of nature conservation?

There are instances in some industrial centers when atmospheric pollution is 5-10 times greater than permissible norms. This has a direct effect on the incidence of illnesses among the population. Statistics are implacable. They reflect, like a mirror, the true state of affairs. Union ministries—above all the Ministries of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry, of the Production of Mineral Fertilizers, of the Electrical Equipment Industry, of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, and of the Construction Materials Industry—are being slow to construct nature conservation projects. One could probably add to the long list many other ministries which are also inactive. The soviets and their organs must use all their rights and the strength of public opinion to rectify the situation as quickly as possible.

The republic has achieved considerable successes in protecting people's health. Considerable! The plans for construction of medical establishments are being fulfilled—and this is good and gratifying—with the overall sickness rate dropping, disease prevention has been stepped up, and medical assistance for children is improving. There are more than 15,000 physicians and 45,000 members of middle-level medical staff looking after the population's health. The number of medical workers available per thousand inhabitants of the republic is higher than the average for the country. It seems that both party organs and soviets have worked well here.

You all understand, of course, that we should not restrict ourselves to material issues alone. The development of man's spiritual sphere is of equal importance. It is well known that decisions by party and state organs place special emphasis on the importance of this sphere. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has spoken on this topic on many occasions. Much is being done in Lithuania in this sphere, and the plans in existence are, let me say plainly, sound.

You have built more than 500 new theaters, museums, exhibition halls, libraries, and houses of culture. This is good.

The republic's achievements in urban development, the transformation of the countryside, and the preservation and restoration of ancient monuments are widely known.

Works by Lithuanian writers are being read in 36 languages of the USSR's peoples and 28 foreign languages today. The Panevezhis Theater and many of your artists, musicians, and cinematographers are famous all over the country and abroad. The poet Eduardas Mezhelaytis is famed throughout the world. I am pleased to note the award of the USSR State Prize to a group of creative workers of the Lithuanian SSR Youth Theater. The culture of Lithuania and its people did not enjoy in the past the recognition it enjoys in Soviet times.

Much is being done for young people in the republic: There are schools, technical colleges, institutes. The republic's 12 VUZ's train young people in 140 specialized fields. It is obvious, however, that more attention must be given to the organization of teaching, there must be more concern for lecturer cadres, the necessary equipment, and the links with production; this work is perhaps of an average standard in your republic. It happens very often that even technical VUZ's lack the appropriate experimental-material base. Books and lecturers are the sole sources of knowledge, and there is no base to test this knowledge by practical work and to experiment with this knowledge. This is a serious omission. Matters are different in other countries. This state of affairs must be set right. This is one of the tasks to be examined by the forthcoming CPSU Central Committee plenum.

Today we are focusing ever greater attention on the soviets' and other state organs' work efficiency; efficiency based not on an increase in the number of sessions, questions examined, and paper covered with writing but on practical deeds. After all, soviets are at the center of the vast practical work on restructuring and are mobilizing the population to fulfill topical tasks.

What can be said today about the standard of the soviets' organizational work? Not all is well here. Soviet sessions are often held in the old way, much of what they do is routine work, there is a shortage of initiative, criticism, and possibly glasnost. This applies not only and not so much to the Lithuanian Republic but to the country as a whole. True enough, this is no consolation for you.

Overregimentation in holding soviet sessions has still not been overcome in the republic. It is possible to hear many complaints that the soviets' staff apparatus edits deputies' speeches, suggests the area on which they must speak, and rations criticism. They bluntly issue prescriptions. This practice must, of course, be ended, not only in theory but also in practice.

However, I would also like to draw your attention to another aspect. Let us state frankly that many deputies themselves have still familiarized themselves badly with the situation which has taken shape in recent years. One senses some sort of "internal" constraint in speeches at sessions of both supreme and local soviets. Certain deputies believe that prescribed speech outlines certainly exist. However, just one thing is required of them: To speak frankly and honestly about the difficulties, about the demands advanced by voters, and about the ways and means to fulfill them. It is not a matter of how a deputy would speak, whether fast like a machinegun or slowly. What is important is the idea itself, the quality of the speech.

As you know, the Law on Nationwide Discussion of Important Questions of State Life was adopted by a USSR Supreme Soviet session immediately following the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum. By way of its further development, the Lithuanian SSR also adopted a corresponding act. But it is not enough to pass laws; work must be launched on a broad scale. The population must be involved right away in broad discussion of problems of socioeconomic development, there must systematic opinion polls on these questions, and the interests of cities, villages, and settlements must be carefully studied.

The activity of soviets and their organs on restructuring and acceleration can be successful only in conditions of complete openness and glasnost. The party Central Committee recently held a conference with leaders of mass news media. It noted in particular the importance of telling people the truth and of making extensive information available, and it criticized shortcomings.

Glasnost today is helping to expose instances of serious violations of socialist legality. Despite the apparent trend toward a drop in crime in your republic, the soviets and their ispolkoms still have insufficient impact on the the process of strengthening legality and safeguarding citizens' rights and interests. There has been no reduction in the number of cases of theft of personal property in Lithuania, and the crime detection figures have actually deteriorated. This is incomprehensible! It would be a different matter if the number of crimes were dropping, but here you have the crime detection indicator dropping. There has been an increase in the number of offenses by drunks and drug addicts. The word "drug addiction" was heard from this rostrum. I was wondering whether it would be heard or not, and it was! The struggle against illicit distilling remains a serious problem.

The people must know that the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism is a struggle for people's health, for the ideal man of the future who was so perceptively and eloquently described by the founders of communist teaching.

The struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism is not a temporary campaign but a constant state line. It would have been good if it had been a temporary campaign which had ended in complete success. Unfortunately, it could turn into a matter of prolonged state work. It is necessary to ensure that everyone enjoys all the good things in life, rather than looking at life through an alcoholic haze.

The struggle for our ideals, for the development of the economy and culture, and for our moral values demands joint efforts by soviets and party organizations. But this must certainly involve a clear definition of their spheres of activity so that soviets do not hide behind the backs of party raykoms and party organizations in general. So that they do not hide!

The question of the role of ispolkoms, their work under the soviets' leadership, and their accountability and responsibility has been specially raised at our conference. This is quite an important question. There are still cases where ispolkoms supplant soviets and deputies. It even happens that it is not the ispolkom but the ispolkom apparatus and even individual ispolkom officials that resolve corresponding questions, bypassing deputies somewhere along the way. This is, of course, abnormal. You are not alone in this respect.

Complaints are received from some republics about rudeness by ispolkom officials and foot-dragging in the solution of matters perturbing the population, yet ispolkoms in their reports frequently concentrate only on successes. This does happen, and quite often at that.

As one of the union republics, Soviet Lithuania participates in the consolidation of our international ties, primarily with the socialist countries. A graphic example of this was provided by the commissioning ahead of schedule of the first stage of the USSR-GDR rail-sea link between the ports of Klaypeda and Mukran [name as published].

The cardinal transformations taking place in the Soviet Union nowadays, including in the Lithuanian Republic, the growth in the Soviet state's international prestige—all this attracts the attention both of our friends and of our enemies. They are watching carefully. If I could use the expression, they are watching through every available microscope and telescope.

With what can we respond? Above all, with successes in developing the economy and resolving social problems, with successes in the sphere of culture. We must ensure that every one of our people really feels the advantages of the socialist way of life. The whole atmosphere in society, in the family, and at school and literature and art must efficiently foster in the population, including in young people, a sense of Soviet patriotism.

We must actively display our implacability toward all forms of nationalism or scorn for the interests of the Soviet state. It is also necessary to wage an uncompromising struggle against those who transform the sense of patriotism into an object of petty local politicking. Our country's people neither have nor will have any need for it.

Acts of ideological subversion against Soviet Lithuania and our other Baltic republic have been stepped up recently. The hostile bourgeois propaganda, using isolated antisocial elements, tries to fan national differences. Only feckless people—and their numbers are, of course, miniscule—could succumb to the influence of this propaganda.

The depth and scope of changes in all spheres of state and social life, the expansion of democracy, the irreversibility of these processes, the guaranteeing of equal rights and freedoms for people of all nationalities in our country—all this is in itself a fitting answer to the slanderers, wherever they might be found, near or far.

The friendship of the peoples is one of the chief mainstays of the Soviet state's unity and strength. It is our sacred duty to cherish it as the asset of the whole people. (Applause)

The profound changes taking place in our country are of tremendous and abiding importance not only for the Soviet people.

It was 2 years ago that the Soviet Union put forward a program to rid the world from nuclear weapons. It is evidently worth recalling that certain circles in the West hastened to dub our program a "utopia" supposedly unattainable in today's world conditions.

We in no way underestimate the difficulties and obstacles in the way of nuclear disarmament, of which there really are many. But it is perfectly possible to overcome them. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's meetings with President Reagan and the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles convincingly prove the realism of our plans and the correctness of the chosen course. It is important now to develop the success achieved and to give a new boost to the process which has begun. It is a question both of halving the strategic arms of the United States and the USSR and of eliminating chemical weapons and reducing conventional arms and armed forces.

The further improvement of the international situation would be helped by the implementation of the large-scale initiatives outlined in Murmansk in October last year. The purpose of these proposals is to help reduce naval activeness in contiguous seas and specifically in the Baltic. An opportunity would emerge to advance also mutually advantageous cooperation in protecting the region's environment, opening up the North's natural resources, and conducting joint research in the Arctic.

In a nutshell, we are striving everywhere—both in Europe and in the other continents—for honest, open, and equal cooperation, free from groundless suspicions, fear, and mistrust.

Comrades! As you know, the 19th all-union party conference will be held this June to examine cardinal problems of the country's life and questions of the further democratization of Soviet society. The achievement of new high indicators in the development of the material and social spheres and the efficiency of restructuring must make a specific contribution to the preparations for this very important event.

Permit me to wish you all and the people of Soviet Lithuania the best results in resolving urgent questions of restructuring and the life of the fraternal republic! (Prolonged applause. All stand.)

Supreme Court Plenum Discusses Housing Disputes

PM160917 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "USSR Supreme Court Plenum"]

[Text] A scheduled USSR Supreme Court plenum has been held under the chairmanship of V.I. Terebilov.

Following a report by P.Ya. Trubnikov, member of the USSR Supreme Court, the plenum discussed the application of legislation by the courts when hearing cases involving disputes between citizens and housing construction cooperatives.

The speaker and plenum participants noted that, in addition to the development of state, public-sector, and individual housing stocks, an important role is played in providing Soviet citizens with housing by cooperative housing construction, which is based on the resources of people belonging to housing construction cooperatives, with some help from state credit. The state assists housing construction cooperatives in the construction, running, and repair of houses belonging to them. Cooperative housing construction helps to solve the serious, socially important housing problem.

By correctly applying legislation when resolving cases connected with the activity of housing construction cooperatives, the courts are urged to protect the rights and legal interests of citizens and cooperatives, contribute to the strengthening of guarantees in the fulfillment of these rights and to the effective use and protection of the housing stock, and prevent any breach of the law in cooperative activity.

In connection with amendments to legislation governing housing construction cooperatives, the plenum interpreted a series of issues which have arisen in legal practice.

Difficulties often arise in legal practice on the question of whether certain disputes between citizens and housing construction cooperatives are within the court's jurisdiction.

The approved resolution indicates in particular that cases based on actions brought by cooperative members concerning the exchange of occupied premises for other premises belonging to the state or public-sector housing stock are within the court's jurisdiction not only when disallowing the general assembly of cooperative members to accept a person involved in such an exchange as a cooperative member but also in cases where the general assembly has given its consent but the local ispolkom has overruled the decision of the general assembly and refused to issue the warrant for the exchange.

If the need to exchange a cooperative apartment arises, but no agreement has been reached on this issue between the member of the cooperative and his family, then he and the members of his family, who have a right to part of the share accumulation, are within their rights to bring a court action on the exchange of these occupied premises, including to other premises belonging to the state or public-sector housing stock. A member of the family who does not have a right to part of the share accumulation cannot bring such an action.

A refusal by the local ispolkom to issue a cooperative member with a warrant for premises allocated to him may be legally contested.

A citizen dropped from a cooperative has the right to bring a court action to recognize this decision as improper, even if it has been approved by the local ispolkom.

A member of a housing construction cooperative has the right to let part of his premises—with the consent of the cooperative board—and, if his family is temporarily absent, he may let the entire premises for a fee within legal limits. A refusal by the cooperative board to consent to the letting of the premises may be legally contested.

At the same time the court does not have the right to resolve issues which, according to the law, are solely within the competence of the cooperative and other organs, particularly the following: The distribution of housing between members of a cooperative, the establishment of the size of entrance fees, shares, and payments by cooperative members for the maintenance and running of the building, and also the admission of new members to a cooperative—with the exception of cases where people described in the Model Housing Construction Cooperative Regulations have a preferential right to become a cooperative member and retain the right to continue using premises in a cooperative building.

The plenum also made it clear that family members living with the member of a housing construction cooperative have the same right as he to use premises in a cooperative building, as long as no other agreement was reached on the procedure for use of the premises when they initially took up residence.

The breakup of the family does not give the cooperative member the right to evict the people living with him. Their eviction may only be allowed in cases prescribed by legislation.

Heirs who have enjoyed the use of an apartment during the life of the owner and who became tenants of this apartment in accordance with established procedure retain the right to continue using this apartment.

Juvenile heirs of a deceased cooperative member, who lived with him in a cooperative apartment, cannot be evicted from these premises in order to terminate the original owner's membership of the cooperative as a result of his death. Until the heir comes of age, his responsibilities concerning the use of the cooperative apartment will be met by a parent, adoptive parent, guardian, or foster parent.

In the event of a cooperative member acquiring a different apartment that has become vacant in the cooperative, all the members of his family—provided they have consented to live in the new premises—are obliged to vacate the previous apartment. At the same time, when granting a cooperative member a different apartment, the cooperative may—in accordance with the established procedure—leave the apartment he has vacated to a member of his family on the condition that the latter becomes a member of the cooperative.

Having ascertained flagrant violation of legislation governing the activity of housing construction cooperatives or the rights of a cooperative member and members of his family, or cases where premises are not being used for their proper purpose (for the purpose of personal gain or the acquisition of unearned income, for example), or failure to ensure the timely repair of cooperative premises, the courts are instructed to use special rulings to bring this to the attention of the appropriate organs or officials so that measures can be taken to eliminate these irregularities.

The plenum discussed proposals from union republic supreme courts concerning amendments to legislation designed to restructure the work of the courts. They will be submitted to legislative organs after elaboration.

The plenum also discussed appeals from the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court and the USSR general prosecutor concerning legal matters.

A.M. Rekunkov, USSR general prosecutor, took part in the plenum.

Demonstration in Soviet Armenia Reported

AU230817 Vienna Domestic Service in German 0600 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] In the capital of the Soviet Republic of Armenia, Yerevan, some 50,000 persons demonstrated for the reintegration of the autonomous Karabakh region [no date given]. About 80 percent of the inhabitants of the Karabakh region are Armenians. The region was incorporated into the neighboring Republic of Azerbaijan under Stalin.

Uzbek Central Committee Plenum Reported

PM161059 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 31 Jan 88 p 1

["Information Report on the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"—PRAVDA VOSTOKA headline]

[Text] The Ninth Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Plenum took place 30 January.

The plenum heard the report of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Bureau on the leadership of restructuring.

R.N. Nishanov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, gave the report on this question.

The following took part in the discussion on the report: Comrades K.S. Salykov, first secretary of the Kara-Kalpak party obkom; A. Abdusamatov, chairman of the "Pakhtakor" Kolkhoz in Bagdadskiy Rayon, Fergana Oblast; S. Yerzhanov, first secretary of of the Kegeyliyskiy party raykom, Kara-Kalpak ASSR; G.Kh. Kadyrov, chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers; M.I. Ibragimov, chairman of the Uzbek SSR State Committee for Physical Culture and Sport; R. Khudaybergenova, chairman of Khorezm Oblispolkom; V.M. Alimov, first secretary of Fergana party gorkom; M.Kh. Khalmukhamedov, secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee; V.P. Anishchev, second secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee; M. Abdullayev, first secretary of the Namangan Oblast Papskiy party raykom; T.A. Alimov, first secretary of Tashkent party obkom; N.I. Popov, commander of the Red Banner Turkestan Military District; M.U. Karimova, weaver at the Margilan "Atlas" textile production association in Fergana Oblast; S.M. Mamarasulov, first secretary of Surkhan-Darya party obkom; Kh. Alimova, chairman of the Uzbekistan Trade Union Council; D.M. Dzhanibekov, second secretary of Navoi party obkom; O.S. Abbasova, Uzbek SSR minister of education; A.G. Manannikov, Uzbek SSR minister of construction; U. Sultanova, secretary of the Tashkent textile combine party committee; V.I. Ogarok, first deputy chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers; B.F. Satin, first secretary of Tashkent party gorkom; R.N. Ivanushkina, sewing equipment operator at the Karshi Sewn Goods Production Association named for the 50th Anniversary of the USSR, Kashka-Darya Oblast; I.Kh. Dzhurabekov, first deputy chairman of the Uzbek SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Uzbek SSR Gosagroprom; V.A. Khaydurov, chairman of the Uzbek SSR People's Control Committee; I.Kh. Aripov, chairman of the "Glavtashkent" Tashkent Housing Construction No 1 Combine trade union committee; V.A. Golovin, chairman of the Uzbek SSR KGB; I.A. Karimov, first secretary of Kashka-Darya party obkom; S. Abdukadyrov, director of the Pushkin Sovkhoz in Bayautskiy Rayon, Syr-Darya Oblast; T.F. Kadyrova, chairman of the Uzbekistan Union of Architects Board; U.R. Umarbekov, Uzbek SSR minister of culture; I. Iskanderov, chairman of the Uzbek SSR Gosplan; B. Zh. Khakimov, chairman of the Namangan Oblispolkom; A.G. Rudenko, secretary of the Uzbekistan Trade Union Council; and U. Alikhodzhayev, actor at the "Uzbekfilm" Studio.

Organizational questions were examined at the plenum. A.F. Zmiyevskiy was ratified as chief of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee Heavy Industry and Machine Building Department, and R.A. Safarov as editor of the republican newspaper PRAVDA VOSTOKA.

A.A. Grishkevich, sector chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department, and I.K. Komarov and V.N. Lavrentev, senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the plenum's work.

At this point the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee plenum completed its work.

Kursk Obkom 'Authoritarian' Methods Criticized

PM161141 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by own correspondent V. Kulagin: "Overcoming Inertia of Stagnation; From Kursk CPSU Obkom Plenum"]

[Text] On the eve of the plenum I had a thorough talk with Obkom First Secretary A. Seleznev. Aleksandr Ivanovich has been in this post for about a month. But in principle he was familiar with the overall situation in the oblast party organization from his former work in the CPSU Central Committee apparatus. In the days preceding the plenum he managed to visit several rayons, primary organizations, labor collectives, and trade enterprises. He familiarized himself with the most important problems of the oblast center. He studied the extensive mail from the people of Kursk.

Summing up his first impressions, A. Seleznev noted:

"The economy, the social sphere, and the oblast's spiritual life have to be led out of stagnation. The main trouble is that there is too great a gulf between the intentions and real deeds of the leaders at oblast and rayon level. We cannot work in the old way but many people have not yet learned to work in the new way. So the crux of the matter is work with cadres."

The plenum was unlike all preceding ones. From the unprecedented activeness of its participants you could feel that people expected a frank talk and direct, keen criticism of the secretaries and bureau members and leading workers of the party obkom apparatus was heard in the speeches of many speakers. That is understanding: Essentially the Kursk people have not yet achieved a fundamental breakthrough in the economy or in the social life of the republic and in some respects are even surrendering the previously won positions. Many examples of this were cited in the CPSU Obkom Bureau report delivered by Obkom First Secretary A. Seleznev.

Let's name a few of the problems. Last year the volume of shortfalls in industrial output contract deliveries had trebled compared with 1986. The proportion of articles of the top category of quality declined. Nor has there been any success so far in ensuring radical changes in the work of transport and communications. The demand for consumer goods and services has not been satisfied. Last year the plans for commissioning fixed capital and for construction and installation work remained unfulfilled and capital investments were not fully assimilated. Agriculture has been marking time for many years. The oblast is in arrears to the state in terms of agricultural output deliveries. Food supplies for the oblast's working people are not improving. Many social questions in the countryside are not being resolved.

Stagnation phenomena do not arise of their own accord, they are created by people. The plenum's participants said frankly that the party obkom bureau members, secretaries and departments chiefs have not yet been able to overcome them in their work.

V. Ivanov, a man with great experience of party work, is in charge of cadre questions in the oblast party organization. He is responsible to the obkom for the construction complex, trade, and the consumer sphere. The main threads of the oblast's party and economic life thus extend to him. The report stated that V. Ivanov is being hampered by excessive impulsiveness, the categorical nature of his opinions, and his unhealthy reaction to critical remarks. Many errors allowed in the selection and promotion of cadres and the slow tempo of social and production development are also to a considerable extent the result of serious blunders in his work. The speakers at the plenum said that V. Ivanov practices an authoritarian style of leadership, does not always consider the opinion of specialists, and silences his opponents with bellowing and even insults and threats.

Arbitrary methods of leadership, the plenum noted, are also inherent in the work style of other obkom secretaries and members—G. Bereznikov and F. Brovkin—and Oblispolkom Chairman N. Zhurkin. Ambition gains the upper hand primarily where the opinions of rank and file Communists and leaders are not heeded. The oblast leaders' excessive self confidence, their reluctance to look into the future, and their desire to restrict themselves to closer and simpler goals inevitably result in real economic and social losses.

Their alienation from the working people's daily needs and their concerns and aspirations today prevented Obkom Secretaries V. Ivanov and F. Brovkin and Oblispolkom Chairman N. Zhurkin from rising above their domineering and officious style even at the plenum. Having acknowledged in passing the criticism against them which, in the businesslike and exacting atmosphere of the plenum, simply could not be overlooked, they continued to feel that they were not reporting but instructing on the rostrum. It was as though they were not subordinate to the obkom but that the obkom was their working organ.

It was this usurping, this gross distortion of the principles of party building, which promoted the formation in Kursk Oblast of authoritarian methods of leaders of the economy, the social sphere, and the party organizations.

The report stated that at elections of party secretaries preference is often given to complaisant workers. Many party gorkoms and raykoms whose leaders also dislike restless people are in solidarity with this practice. As a result there is a frequent turnover of cadres. In less than 2 years over 1,000 party organization secretaries, 236 leaders of the industrial sector, and about 500 leaders in the agro-industrial complex have been replaced. This bold sweep in reassigning cadres is by no means a sign of exactingness and concern for their purity. Frequently matters end with the transplantation of an untalented worker from one leading position to another. For instance, V. Aseyev once made a mess of the work of the oblast's fruit and vegetable farming association. His name was often cursed at obkom plenums and oblast soviet sessions. He is now living a calm life as first deputy chairman of the oblast agroprom for socioeconomic development. In these cases it is far from always that the obkom bureau sets an example of party principledness. Organizational conclusions with regard to compromised workers are often drawn only after the intervention of higher-ranking party organs or the central press. It was in just this way that V. Anpilogov, M. Zaytsev, and V. Kirichenko were dismissed from the posts of first secretary of, respectively, Oktyabrskiy, Belovskiy, and Pristenskiy rayons.

Many leaders, the plenum stressed, lack political training, a profound understanding of their tasks, and the ability to analyze processes and to make every effort in working under the conditions of restructuring and glasnost.

The Kursk Obkom plenum showed most obviously that the inertia of stagnation in the oblast party organization has still not been overcome. All party committees must resolutely increase their efficiency, doggedness, and persistence in resolving problems of restructuring. At the same time the activeness of the plenum participants and the civic, constructive mood of their speeches attests to their desire to overcome inertia and break the delaying mechanism as rapidly as possible. An important conclusion has been drawn: To make headway, to be in the thick of restructuring, an influx of fresh forces is needed not only to the rayon echelon of management but also to the party obkom apparatus and its leading organs.

Kazakh Supreme Soviet Elects Presidium Chairman

PM160903 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Feb 88 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by own correspondent V. Ardayev under the "Union Republic Supreme Soviet Sessions" rubric: "The Kazakh SSR"]

[Text] Alma-Ata—A session of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet has examined the question of the work of Tselinograd Oblast soviets in carrying out restructuring in conditions of democratization and glasnost in the light of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum.

K. Taukenov, chairman of the Tselinograd Oblispolkom, noted in his report that most of the oblast's local soviets are resolutely restructuring their style and methods of work. They have markedly stepped up their efficiency and initiative, and deputies have learned to study public opinion in more depth, to take it into account, and to more actively involve the population in resolving pressing problems. Assemblies of citizens and reports by leaders of soviet organs to voters are now being conducted in a more lively and committed way.

At the same time the session noted that the work of the soviets and their ispolkoms does not yet fully measure up to the tasks of speeding up socioeconomic development at the new stage of restructuring. According to last year's results almost 1 in 3 of the oblast's enterprises failed to meet its contractual commitments and only 14.7 percent of goods received the State Quality Seal. Plan targets for utilizing capital investments in the construction of hospitals, schools, and other facilities in the social sphere were not met. As a rule this has happened where local ispolkoms are restructuring their activity without due committment or consistency and where formalism, overorganization, and bureaucracy are being eradicated too slowly.

The session examined an organizational question. S. Mukashev was released from his duties as chairman of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on his retirement on pension. Z. Kamalidenov, who worked as secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, was elected chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The Law "On People's Discussion of Important Questions of State Life" was adopted.

G. Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, took part in the session's work.

Former Kazakh Party Chief's Aide Sentenced

PM151251 Moscow TRUD in Russian 14 Feb 88 p 6

[Report by correspondent O. Kvyatkovskiy under the "After Sentencing" rubric: "Out of the Shadow Into the Light"; final paragraph is TRUD postscript]

[Text] Alma-Ata—"No matter, time will pass and your children will crawl up to mine with outstretched hands. And they will say: Wasn't it your father who put our daddy in prison? Your father? Well, you can get out...."

This was said with unconcealed malice at one of his interrogations by Duysetay Bekezhanov, former aide to the former Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee first secretary. I was told about it by the man to whom this "prophesy" was addressed—A. Yerubayev, senior investigator for especially important cases at the Kazakh SSR Prosecutor's Office.

Yes, it looks as though even behind bars Bekezhanov is still hoping that "his" time will return. He cannot come to terms with the fact that all the privileges which he criminally enjoyed for many years have collapsed all at once. But his time has passed and there will be no return. A guarantee of this is the process of democratization and cleansing which is proceeding firmly and consistently in the republic. This is also borne out by the trial which has just ended in Alma-Ata.

D. Kunayev's former aide was considered, not without justification, as virtually omnipotent. He is now trying to persuade the judges that an aide is only a "little man" in the shadow of his "master."

Some people "in the shadow" felt they could act with impunity, and for nearly 25 years Bekezhanov played far from the least role among them. Illumined, in the eyes of those around him, by his many years' proximity to "the man himself" and provided with numerous means of influence, he did whatever he wanted....

In the case there is an application form of virgin freshness without an envelope or post mark, which has spent less than a minute lying on any desk: "I, Ospanov Khamza, need an apartment." That's all. No address or job is listed for Khamza and there is no list of his services. It is as though God himself, who has no need of a character reference, had suddenly deigned to grant a request for walls and a roof. There is an official stamp from above for the Central Committee administrator of affairs: "Comrade Kunayev has asked for assistance. Bekezhanov." And who, given this stamp, will start to inquire whether or not he has asked for assistance? Certainly not the former administrator of affairs (now serving a long prison term). Khamza moved to a three-room apartment within 24 hours, and that was that.

A mere detail compared with everything that Bekezhanov did. Even during the restructuring which had begun it was he who headed the persecution of N. Nazarbayev, the new chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, who had "dared" from the rostrum of the party congress to speak sharply against Kunayev's methods of leadership.... A flood of anonymous letters, shadowing, telephoned threats to members of his family were organized. Arrested criminals were asked to sign fabricated evidence against the head of the republic's government and were promised reduced terms of imprisonment in return. But the shameful campaign failed: They did not succeed in intimidating or breaking N. Nazarbayev. Those who were "smeared" sought "approaches" to Bekezhanov, using various means to curry favor with him. After all, they knew in advance that all their humiliations and expenses would be justified, they would be repaid a hundred times over if only they were able to approach him.

Makhanov, former Kazakh deputy minister of automotive transport, succeeded in "approaching" Bekezhanov on two occasions. The first "approach" cost R5,000. The second, R3,000. He knew what he was paying for: He needed support, for the ground was already disappearing from under his feet; Minister Karavayev had already been arrested.

Bekezhanov's office contained "bulletproof waistcoats," so to speak, protecting embezzlers of public funds, intriguers, and informers of various kinds.... His patronage was enjoyed by many "yesterday's men"—Terzeman, first secretary of the Talgarskiy Raykom; sovkhoz director Nurov; economic leaders Smykov and Kovinko; "Kazakhtelefilm" studio director Akhmetov.... Against each of these names our times have made a note attesting to the fact that they have received their just deserts: "dismisssed," "expelled," "convicted."

After his arrest, Askarov, who used to work as first secretary of the Alma-Ata party obkom and then the Chimkent party obkom, told Bekezhanov at a confrontation:

"Everyone was afraid of you! They knew you had amassed considerable power, and by no means through your abilities."

During the investigation and the trial several hundred people gave evidence. "Yesterday's men"—those who only recently were spoken about with circumspection in the republic—filed into the city courtroom. Again and again they were heard to say:

"I broke the law.... I knew I shouldn't.... But you must understand that I could not refuse Bekezhanov. Refusal would have cost me my job, and not just my job..."

They broke themselves, their dignity and honor, in fulfilling illegal "instructions," "advice," and "requests." Indeed it was not only themselves but the authority of state institutions which they allowed to be trampled; it was no longer the country, no longer people, whom they served, they simply fawned upon the man whose duplicity they themselves could clearly see.

The photographs associated with the case attest to how all this looked. They show freeze frames from a truly "royal hunt" mingled with shots of imposing interiors and meals and (it is hard not to shift here from facts to psychology) they show many faces distorted by servility....

Later, having experienced humiliation, these people did not spare those whom they kept in their personal shadow. They stood to gain from them twice over. So the example set by Bekezhanov ate away the system of official relations like rust.

The above-mentioned Askarov went to him cap in hand. Here is what he told the investigation:

"I was working in Alma-Ata. There was a man called Masheyev there, he was responsible for an accident and wanted to shift the blame. He was expelled from the party. 'Bek' kept telephoning: 'Restore him to his position!' I refused. But then Masheyev himself passed on Bekezhanov's message: 'No need to hurry, Askarov has had his day, we are sending him to Chimkent.' I myself still did not know this. I was constantly receiving slander addressed to the then first secretary. But I wanted to retire on pension in one piece. I took R5,000 and an 'Orient' clock. I sent them to Bekezhanov in his office before the plenum. Not to ensure that he spoke well of me, he would not speak well of me; merely to ensure that he did not speak ill of me...."

Some people without consciences or talent lived under Bekezhanov in a way they did not dream of living honestly. His "fellow countryman" Yesimzhanov, a convicted criminal, received a "Volga" automobile and a four-room improved apartment without any wait. Akuyev, commander of a State Automobile Inspection special division, who is under investigation, was reinstated in the party with Bekezhanov's assistance and promoted. The morally corrupt Suleymenov, the brother-in-law of the "omnipotent one," received militia ranks one after another ahead of schedule and became first deputy chief of the Alma-Ata Internal Affairs Administration. "Cases" were closed and reexamined, housing, privileges, and posts were issued following telephone calls from his office....

People like him believed they were allowed to do everything. What had been created through the efforts of the mass of honest workers was for them only a means of organizing their own well being. Parasitism—that is their innermost essence.

I spent hours watching a video recording showing Bekezhanov's confrontations with Askarov and Makhanov and others who only recently considered themselves completely "protected" against objective, public assessments. They are now shouting each other down so loudly that I have to turn down the volume.

"What did you give me? You only know how to take!..."

Yes, recently this was all reality. There existed what now makes us wonder again and again—do you mean that all this was done in our time?

They say: How much can be exposed? They say that ideals will be shaken. No, ideals will only strengthen in the light of the present truth, totally losing everything which used to cover them.

From the editorial office. The Alma-Ata city court sentenced D. Bekezhanov to 8 years' imprisonment in a strict labor colony with the confiscation of his property for the abuse of his official position and the taking of bribes.

New Style Party Report Meetings Assessed

PM161138 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 88 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "After the Reports of Elected Organs: Communists Should Set About the Restructuring More Vigorously"]

[Text] Just over 4 months remain until the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. An important stage in preparations for it was the meetings of Communists and party committee plenums to discuss the elected organs' reports on work in leading the restructuring.

Periodical reports by leading organs to those who elect them are an essential norm of CPSU life. But the reports presented in November 1987-January 1988 may justifiably be called a fundamentally new phenomenon in party practice. For the first time on an all-embracing scale the elected organs were obliged to carry out a searching evaluation of their own activity and report not "in general terms," but in concrete detail; to report sincerely and exhaustively; to report on the cause and in the name of the cause.

Was the intention fully realized everywhere? What impression did the report meetings, conferences, and plenums make on the thoughts and actions of the elected aktiv and the other Communists? What did they teach us? Such questions are in the forefront today. In the majority of party organizations the discussion of the reports, as envisaged by the corresponding CPSU Central Committee resolution, took place in a spirit of the utmost frankness, true democracy, glasnost, profound analysis, and constructive criticism and self-criticism. Often, judging by reports from the localities, it was tough going both for those who were criticized and for those doing the criticizing. A good education!

All the party's affairs, V.I. Lenin noted, are conducted by all its members, with equal rights and without any exceptions. In the years of stagnation this fundamental principle was apparently rather overlooked in some places. So it turned out that here, party affairs were conducted by a narrow circle of comrades, while the others merely paid their subscriptions on time and sat at the meetings without participating, as if serving their time. Strange as it may seem, the "passive" group often included, willy-nilly, a considerable proportion of the members of the elected nucleus of the primary party organizations, higher committees, and their bureaus. The major significance of the essentially partywide discussion of urgent problems lies first and foremost in the fact that with the clear light of mutual exactingness it has dispelled the fog of indifference and apathy that had grown up over the decades in some organizations, and in others has shaken many people out of a state of sluggish interpretation of events. Equally importantly, it has given new strength to those Communists, party committees, and leaders who are in the vanguard of the restructuring.

Mention should be made of the Communists' resolve in utilizing the right, so to speak, to draw organizational conclusions. As a result many thousands of elected organs had their leadership strengthened or their composition replenished. A considerable number of people who were unable to cope with their duties or who had compromised themselves were removed from the organs. The Communists, deeming the work of many party committees and primary organization bureaus and the bureaus of a number of raykoms to be unsatisfactory, elected new bodies. Thus the atmosphere of responsibility, creative purposefulness, and efficiency was tangibly strengthened in the localities. That is what is necessary in order to ensure a substantial stepping up of work in all party components and to eliminate a certain laggardness in relation to the dynamics of the times.

Today the criterion for evaluating the activity of party organs is, in practice, real restructuring, tangible improvements in the economy, in the social and spiritual spheres, in improving people's well-being and living and working conditions, and in strengthening order and discipline. These were the standpoints from which the approaches of party organizations, committees, and bureaus were examined in relation to the key problems—the further democratization of public life and the implementation of radical economic reform. Supporting the enterprising quest for the most effective methods of exerting political influence in the main areas of the restructuring, the Communists openly condemned the tendency to put on a show, the formalism, and the attempts, in the guise of stepping up monitoring, to revive command and control methods and petty tutelage over everyone and everything, phenomena that are manifesting themselves in the course of the resolution of new tasks.

Far more frequently than before, the adherents of hoary stereotypes and cliches were mentioned by name and specific individuals' errors and omissions were analyzed without reference to their posts. One of many instances: At the Rostov party obkom plenum serious defects were uncovered in the work of secretary and bureau member V. Gubskiy. His style, it emerged from the speeches, reeks of voluntarist administrative rule. "Sending down" to the rayons orders like: Have such-and-such a number of livestock by such-and-such a date, and not a head fewer, Vladimir Mikhaylovich is fond of repeating: "And no fidgeting in the ranks..." It is hardly necessary to add more lines to the "portrait" of those political leaders who are to this day fulfilling a mission that is beyond them (and such people were not only spoken of in Rostov). Calls for people to learn more persistently to work in the new way, to learn political methods of leadership, sounded all the more convincing in the course of the exchange of opinions.

The report campaign that has now ended was undoubtedly a considerable step in implementing the 27th CPSU Congress' instructions on stepping up the role of collegial organs in the elaboration of well thought-out, considered decisions and the monitoring of their fulfillment and of the activity of leadership cadres. The party committees' thorough preparations for the reports paid off. The setting up of analytical working parties, the preliminary publication of theses, discussions in the local press, questionnaires, meetings of leaders and members of elected organs in the primary party organizations and labor collectives, sensible amendments to the procedure for the meetings and plenums themselves—it is impossible to list all the innovations.

Characteristically, where the discussion took place in the new way, without the tiresome empty verbiage and overcautiousness, but honestly and frankly, the Communists spoke out for the need to preserve and develop the experience gained in the course of preparing for the discussion of the reports. Indeed, it would be absolutely unforgivable if it was confined to a single episode, an exception to the rule. It is no use waiting for the next "instructions from above." It is within the powers and the rights of the Communists themselves to establish not only at meetings, but in daily intraparty life an atmosphere of Bolshevik openness, principle, and exacting comradeship.

This task is all the more important and urgent in that even at meetings, conferences, and plenums of special political significance it proved impossible to avoid "going over old ground." It emerged that in many party organizations and their leadership the restructuring is still replaced by futile but reassuring talk, while sharp words and truthful criticism are relegated to the smoking room and, so to speak, the open air. Say what you like out there, people say, but don't mount the platform! Once again those who are skilled in turning businesslike discussions into orchestrated "measures" made their presence felt in some places. Many people are finding it hard to get rid of the habit of using the platform for routine self-praise and reports of victories and for parasitical requests and compliments to presidium members.

It is well known that in the course of the report campaign the higher party organs repeatedly had to resort to extreme measures—stopping and in essence revoking discussions that did not hit the target and holding them again. As a rule both the primary party organization secretaries and the representatives of party committees who were present were called strictly to account for the low standard of meetings. Serious lessons! Very serious!

The report meetings were, for the elected organs and all the Communists, a test of compliance with the times and demands of restructuring. Now the most important thing is to move on from discussions to practical work and ensure the unity of word and deed, decisions and actions.

Minister Interviewed on Nuclear Power Safety

PM151451 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 10 Feb 88 p 1

[Interview with USSR Nuclear Power Generation Minister N. Lukonin by G. Lomanov: "Safe Technology. USSR Minister of Nuclear Power Generation Describes How To Improve AES Reliability"; date and place not given—boldface as published]

[Text] [Lomanov] Nikolay Fedorovich, for years nuclear power stations were said to be completely harmless, safe, and highly reliable. It must be admitted that we journalists also formed this serene attitude: I cannot count the number of times I have seen in the press the thesis that a nuclear power station discharges into the atmosphere far fewer radioactive elements than, for example, a thermal power station.

[Lukonin] This is not an attempt to varnish reality—it is a correct idea even now. When normally operated, a nuclear power station's discharge is indeed less harmful, much less harmful.

[Lomanov] Normally operated.... It is nearly 2 years since the Chernobyl accident, but the consequences are still being felt. It must be said that it has swelled the ranks of doubters and of out-and-out opponents of the development of nuclear power. And it has reinforced their arguments. We can hardly discuss all aspects of the problem, so let us talk about one of the main ones: safety.

[Lukonin] To say after a major accident that nuclear power is one of the most ecologically clean and safe sectors is to attract a hail of criticism and charges of departmental bias. But it is so nonetheless. Nuclear power stations now produce 17 percent of the world's electricity—imagine how the balance of nature would change if thermal power stations took over this percentage. How many harmful substances—oxides of nitrogen, sulfur, and ash—would be released into the atmosphere? How much oxygen would the combustion technology consume? Indeed, it also reduces the area of forests—the main "factories" of oxygen.

The damage caused by the Chernobyl accident runs into billions of rubles. But are the losses as a result of wrecked tankers any less? Isn't an oil slick covering a vast expanse of water disastrous for living things? And wasn't the accident at the chemical enterprise in India, in Bhopal, a catastrophe for thousands of people?

So what do we do—curtail thermal power, petrochemicals, transport, and nonferrous metallurgy? We are living in a time when people and nature are under very powerful and dangerous technological pressure. It is a modern reality that must be faced, and the harmful effects must be reduced to a minimum. Are we to go back to rushlights? In my view, that is utopianism. But to believe that the development of nuclear power spells disaster for mankind is both incorrect and unfair.

[Lomanov] But here are some figures—since nuclear power stations came into being, there have been approximately 20,000 accidents at them worldwide. Such information has not been published before in the general press—is it any wonder that it is now making many people anxious.

[Lukonin] Let us examine in an unbiased way the origin of these figures and whether they give cause for concern. Sometimes you read: "There has been an accident at such and such a nuclear power station and the power unit has been shut down." In fact, there has not been an accident; in such cases engineers use a different term—failure. Yes, a switch or pump has failed, something has happened to a turbine, separator, or electric motor. In short, a piece of equipment that in no way affects the operation of the reactor and safety of the station has broken down. But the power unit has to be shut down for repair. This happens 4-5 times a year at every unit—not just ours, but all over the world. The "alarming" statistics are culled from shutdowns of that type. I stress that these situations are no threat either to personnel or to the population. But cases where there is a discharge of radioactivity are extremely rare—a mere handful in all the time that nuclear power has been developed. For example, in Britain in 1956—the accident was kept secret. That was possible then, but it is not possible now. There is a network of observation posts in nearly every country. A serious accident involving a release of radioactivity would be noticed immediately.

[Lomanov] At Chernobyl the personnel made five mistakes. The reactor held out. It "succumbed" to the sixth. The impression is that in the "man-machine" system it is the first element that tends to fail.

[Lukonin] Five gross mistakes, in actual fact it was more than that.... At the Chernobyl AES, discipline generally—and technological discipline in particular—was unacceptably low. This has been said many times, so there is no point in repeating it. I will say what is being done to improve the standard of operators' professional training and mental preparation. But first, allow me to digress. I remember going to work in nuclear power, at a station, after leaving the VUZ. There were jokers everywhere. They liked to play a trick or two on a new boy, make a fool of him. There was no danger, but people could not work. Some were dismissed

I mention this because I want to say that in our business much depends on attitude and mental condition. It was impressed upon us that if the situation was unclear, it was better to be safe and shut the power unit down. We remain grateful to our teachers for this. There were cases where we shut down unnecessarily, but we were never punished for it. Because it would have made a worker frightened to shut the reactor down in a really dangerous situation. Now that nuclear power has become an independent sector, we will observe this rule unswervingly.

There is another psychological aspect. When everything is running smoothly and quietly, people relax. In an emergency they may lose their heads. To avoid this, we will constantly train and test personnel. We used to have one training center. Now we have set up another two—for training teams working at VVER-1000 and BRMK-1000 [reactor designation as published] reactors. There are full-scale training exercises at which it is possible to simulate every conceivable emergency and train and test each individual worker and the whole team. The sector has been given new quotas and it is now able to organize another shift—a seventh, reserve shift—at every station. This will make it possible to put all personnel at each station through a training center.

[Lomanov] But even a very experienced specialist, someone who has undergone splendid training and conditioning, can lose his head and make a mistake....

[Lukonin] It is not impossible. But even if an operator makes a mistake the reactor must in no circumstances run away.

[Lomanov] And this can be ensured from the technical viewpoint?

[Lukonin] Yes. Since the Chernobyl accident, we have considered it our chief task to ensure the internal safety of the reactor core. A great deal has been done to this end. In the first place, containment control systems have been modernized. It used to take 18 seconds to immerse in the core the rods which stop the flow of neutrons. Now it takes 12 seconds. And the design has been altered in such a way that a rod can be let down from any level. The operation will not cause any dangerous perturbations in the reactor. This has been done not only at Chernobyl, but at all stations. At the Ignalinskaya AES a system is being tested which ensures complete immersion of the rods in 2 seconds. In 2 years' time, this protection system will have been installed at all BRMK reactors. It protects against the most unlikely emergencies. I believe even the nonspecialists will appreciate that. In fact, given the slightest doubt, the reactor can be inhibited almost instantly.

[Lomanov] But if the operators do not have any doubts, what then?

[Lukonin] You are right, absolutely reliable protection against potential operator error is needed. So extra fixed absorbers have been installed on all the reactors operating in the country. It will be technically impossible for personnel to take them out of the core. It takes more than 1 hour to remove one. And there are 81 additional absorbers in every reactor.

Fuel that is between 2 and 2.4 percent enriched with uranium-235 is now being replaced. This will further increase safety inside the reactor. The aim is to achieve a better ratio of uranium and graphite and alter the reactor's performance from the neutron physics viewpoint in such a way that in no circumstances can the reactor run away.

[Lomanov] Nikolay Fedorovich, even a popular account of the technical details will not be intelligible to every reader. In a few words, what has been the result of the measures that have been adopted?

[Lukonin] Even if—supposing the incredible happens—the personnel of a particular power unit makes the same number of gross errors as at Chernobyl, an accident would not occur.

Of course, this does not give a complete picture of our work to improve nuclear power station reliability and safety. For example, we are worried about the pipes in the first circuit, particularly in inaccessible places. We need a system to identify defects as they begin to appear, a kind of clinic. After all, it is easier to prevent a disease than cure it. Unfortunately, our suppliers have paid little attention to this problem, so it will be 1990-1992 before we get production models of early diagnosis systems. In the meantime, we have developed some instruments ourselves and supplied nuclear power stations in Armenia and at Chernobyl with them. But, on the whole, we believe that the people developing and manufacturing equipment should supply it complete with diagnostic facilities.

A reliability center has been set up in the sector. It gathers and analyzes information on breakdowns and identifies weak spots. The automatic facilities controlling the technological process are one. Alas, the component base is unreliable, speed is low, and the memory is poor. By 1992 the Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems is to develop an Automated System for the Control of Technological Processes matching up to modern requirements. And now we have introduced state acceptance, and are organizing long "training sessions" for each automated control system even before startup. We are identifying defects and sometimes reject 10-15 percent of the units. But systems have started to operate more reliably. We have seen that from the example of four power units commissioned last year.

[Lomanov] But theory states that absolutely reliable equipment does not exist. And the more complex it is, the greater the likelihood of failure.

[Lukonin] That is why scientists and designers try to avoid unnecessary complications and simplify equipment wherever possible. One cannot give a 100-percent guarantee that a particular assembly will not break down sooner or later. But, I repeat, not every failure or even a series of malfunctions can cause an accident, let alone a serious one. Eliminating the possibility of catastrophes like Chernobyl is a perfectly realistic proposition. It is this absolute that we are striving for.

[Lomanov] The correct choice of a site for the construction of a nuclear power station is one passive method of ensuring safety. This question worries the inhabitants of many cities, especially those virtually on whose doorsteps nuclear heat supply stations are being constructed. Has the plan for the siting of stations been adjusted at all?

[Lukonin] The main thing is still the safety of the stations, but the siting of them was planned taking into account a safe distance from big cities, the seismicity of the area, the nature of the rocks, and the wind rose.... But the plan has now been revised, and future stations will be further away from population centers. Nuclear stations providing both heat and power remain profitable when hot water is piped distances of up to 50 kilometers. Nuclear stations supplying only heat are being constructed in Gorkiy and Voronezh. They use ordinary low-pressure reactors and well-studied structural materials, and the reactor vessel is enclosed in another, safety vessel.

[Lomanov] The newspapers have written in detail about Chernobyl. But could we have a few words about the situation at the station today.

[Lukonin] The main problems are past. A vast amount of work has been done to decontaminate the station itself, hundreds of population centers, and the contaminated area, and to bury the radioactive residue. The fourth power unit was enclosed and has ceased to release dangerous material. The discharge is a fraction of that of the first and second units, which are operating normally. December saw the startup of the third unit, although not without misgivings. But technical methods were found to improve the radiation situation. It is even more tranquil than at the first and second power units.

Finally, just one figure: Last year the personnel of the Chernobyl AES were exposed to an average of 1.5 rems. Compare that with international norms—5 rems per year. This year we intend to reduce the indicator to 1.2 rems.

[Lomanov] Nikolay Fedorovich, let us go back to the start of our conversation. In order to deflect possible charges of narrow-mindedness, perhaps it would be a good idea to have a wide-ranging discussion of the concept of the development of nuclear power? So that the story of the redirection of northern rivers and of Baykal is not repeated....

[Lukonin] An exchange of views is always useful. But it must be an authoritative discussion, based on knowledge of the facts, not just emotions. Glasnost alone is not enough to solve the complex problems. You also need the proper skills. Then there can be a serious, practical discussion. Indeed, in actual fact, it has already begun.

Public 'Not Yet Ready' To Debate Psychiatry

PM191635 Moscow TRUD in Russian 16 Feb 88 p 4

[NOVOSTI scientific observer Eleonora Gorbunova article under the rubric "Polemical Notes": "Psychiatry as a Profession: About Risks, Love, and Glasnost"; boldface as published]

[Text] On 23 November last year the funeral of Boris Petrovich Fedosov, a psychiatrist of 35 years' standing, took place in Moscow. He died from stab wounds in the back inflicted by a mental patient. The murderer burst into the surgery in the psychoneurological center unexpectedly, and Dr Fedosov did not even manage to turn around. Another doctor, Yevgeniy Nikolayevich Porshnev, who was nearby was unable to prevent the tragedy. He himself sustained many wounds and was unconscious for over a month. His condition remains serious.

Psychiatry is a risky profession. Doctors know, of course, that the flareups of aggression are not the patients' fault. The characteristic feature of mental illness consists precisely in the fact that the patient loses control over his actions, and it cannot always be predicted when these actions might end in disaster. However, I would like to draw attention to one alarming circumstance here. Last year, 65 cases of aggressive behavior on the part of mental patients directed at staff of psychoneurological centers were registered in Moscow. One of the reports to the Moscow chief psychiatrist from Center No 2 reads:

"On 9 October during a first visit in response to a call by relatives citizen M., not formerly registered at the clinic, seriously injured section psychiatrist G.V. Sigunov with a small-bore rifle. After committing the crime, M. hid with the rifle. It must be noted that the aggressiveness of mental patients has risen in recent months. They come to the center demanding to be taken off the register or to be allowed to drive motor vehicles. During consultations either the patients themselves or their relatives frequently bring along press articles on psychiatric themes. Many behave insultingly and threaten reprisals unless their demands are met."

The first "symptoms" of raised aggressiveness coincided with the middle of last year. In Moscow leaflets with the slogan "Death to the Psychiatrists!" were even disseminated. Prior to this, a theory about patients' all but "total defenselessness" in the face of psychiatrists' arbitrariness had been published in one of the reputable newspapers.... An intuitive fear of mental illness and prejudice against the psychiatric profession is alive in almost all of us. It is therefore not surprising that there are people who are ready unconditionally to believe in the stories that have been published. The stormy response, including the response from mental patients, is not surprising either.

"I was sent to a psychiatric hospital around 25 times," Muscovite P. writes. "On three occasions I was in a demented state. At all other times I was perfectly normal. If I was allowed to, I would shoot all psychiatrists with rubber bullets." "I would like to know," K., an inhabitant of Leningrad asks, "whether all these scoundrels and villains will be made an example of. The Inquisition, the Siguranta [Romanian secret police], the Third Degree—all pale in comparison with the crimes which these animals have committed against people. They ought to be..."

I cannot proceed with the quote. The calls for revenge are addressed to psychiatrist I.M. Milopolskaya, whom the author of the letter has never even met. Yet she has never transgressed the laws of either professional or human conduct. This is the conclusion of the Moscow Main Health Administration which examined the details of the case.

This is not the place to express either doubts as to the competence of the authors of these writings or surprise at the persistence with which they oppose authoritative experts' assessments of **purely professional** problems (and specifically, the way in which they make or reject diagnoses of mental disorders...). What is at issue here is something more important: to grasp and admit aloud that articles which pursued an apparently humane aim have evoked just the reverse reaction, artificially dramatizing an already complex situation.

Patients refuse to be examined or hospitalized, and doctors are confronted with the printed word: Society is not allowed to enforce treatment. Even in extreme cases, where relatives or neighbors call in an emergency psychiatric team to deal with a raving mental patient, the medics frequently have to stop in front of closed doors. They are faced with the dilemma as to whether they should try to force them open. What if the call was a false alarm and the intrusion is interpreted as abuse? All kind of conflict situations are inevitable in the psychiatric profession if you try to discharge your professional duty. Let us recall the visit by G.V. Sigunov which ended in tragedy. If you accept the demand expressed in the press that treatment of patients who refuse to accept help can be enforced only by the prosecutor or a court decision, the doctor is bound to be blamed if he intervenes. After all, the patient had categorically refused even to talk to him. If the doctor had gone away, he would not have been seriously injured. But who would then have been shot with the loaded rifle? The relatives who called the doctor but left the house? Passers-by? However, let us ask another question. Will we be able to blame psychiatrists if they, under the pressure of accusations, try to sidestep situations which require their presence but are clearly fraught with conflict?

Psychiatry is the dramatic sector of medicine. The professional duty of any doctor is to alleviate suffering. However, psychiatrists are charged with an additional duty by society—to protect it from the actions of mental patients who create havoc and are sometimes downright dangerous. This requires a continuous, ongoing medical observation of patients and prompt treatment to prevent an aggravation of the disease. So far there is simply no other way of preventing patients from acting unpredictably and coming into conflict with society. However, the patients usually regard themselves as perfectly normal and try to convince those around them that they do not need treatment. The need for treatment is not always obvious to those around them, either. In such cases, people with a poor understanding of medicine frequently have doubts as to whether treatment is really indicated and hospitalization is necessary. These natural doubts easily turn into distrust and even hatred of psychiatrists, especially if this is encouraged.

The public debate on this score ought to have brought us closer to an understanding of the specific characteristics of mental illness and the problems faced by psychiatrists, and it should have dispersed the widespread prejudice. But will it be possible to bring down the barrier created by a lack of understanding if we are persistently warned that people do not try to avoid psychiatrists for nothing, that it is better to suffer or consult private practitioners rather than go to a medical center where they are likely to "ruin your life"?

It appears as if the aim of the psychiatric profession is to crucify the individual. This is not a new thesis. It is possible to recall the sad events of the sixties, when the "antipsychiatry movement" started in developed capitalist countries. Its champions also claimed that mental illness was a psychiatrists' invention and that it was the society which was sick, alienating people and isolating those who displease it.

"The attempt to resolve highly specialized questions using public opinion appears naive to us," experts from Naro-Fominsk No 23 psychiatric hospital write. "For instance, it is claimed that our nosological classification of mental diseases (which we pioneered and which has been adopted in many other countries) has much to learn from the French school which apparently denies the existence of mental diseases and recognizes only individual syndromes. Sad examples of attempts to 'solve' this type of question by a nationwide poll are known from the history of the development of genetics in our country, for instance."

So what is the use of reviving the postulates of "antipsychiatry" long debunked by specialists and of side-tracking us from real problems? The latter cannot be resolved by deliberately drawing on distrust. These are the thoughts that involuntarily come to mind when reading in a second newspaper that the arbitrariness and subjectivism which reign in the system of diagnosis and hospitalization of mental patients have led to abuses of all kinds and that many psychiatrists are fighting with might and main against glasnost in this sphere.

Meanwhile, back at the beginning of last year, at the first press conference given by the new USSR Health Minister Ye.I. Chazov, psychiatry was named among the problems demanding press attention.... The minister stated precisely where unacceptable conditions prevailed in the provision of assistance to patients.

Many "problem areas" have accumulated in our society. There are plenty of them in medicine and psychiatry too. Last April this so-called "classified topic" was the subject of a discussion by the USSR Health Ministry Collegium from which journalists were by no means barred.

The Collegium deemed it urgent to draw up legislation to embrace all the numerous departmental and interdepartmental instructions and regulations about the rights and benefits of mental patients provided for in various legal documents and to clarify the principles governing the provision of medical assistance and discard obsolete instructions.

At the beginning of this year the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium approved a new statute on the terms and procedure for providing psychiatric assistance to citizens. For the first time the entire range of measures governing the provision of medical and social assistance to people suffering from mental illness has acquired the nature of an integrated law. It makes it incumbent on local organs' executive committees to display concern for mental patients, to defend their rights and legitimate interests, and to take measures to involve them in social life; to ensure their placement in jobs and organize special production capacities with eased working conditions; and to contribute to the improvement of their housing conditions. The statute clearly defines the rights and obligations of doctors who provide psychiatric assistance, including conditions for emergency hospitalization and psychiatric certification. It includes measures designed to forestall possible wrong diagnoses. Specifically, the chief psychiatrist of the city, rayon, oblast, or republic is entrusted with the supervision of all hospitalizations carried out against the patient's will. Both the patient and his relatives or legal representatives have the right to contest the emergency hospitalization by appealing to the prosecutor's office or a court.

The discussion of psychiatric problems by the Ministry of Health Collegium can be seen to be producing real action. For instance, the system of patient registration is being reviewed, and all patients who do not require ongoing observation are being taken off the list. Yet even before this, registration was not a "social stigma" that stayed with you throughout your life, as some people are trying to claim. This is borne out by the fact that in Moscow alone 4,000 people were crossed off the list in 1986, and around 5,000 in 1987. Measures are being adopted to develop the provision of assistance outside medical centers, improve the cadre situation, enhance doctors' qualifications, and tighten up certification requirements. At the same time a Supreme Certification Commission has been set up at the USSR Ministry of Health—a kind of court of honor which examines instances of mistakes, violations, and malpractices. I believe that it would be right for this court of honor also to judge doctors who abuse the prestige of their profession and cause damage to people's health by misinforming the population. There is no need to look far for examples.

In one article a doctor writes about the use in psychiatry of neuroleptic drugs which he claims can turn a healthy person into a sick one. This is what specialists at a psychiatric hospital at the city of Andropov write in response to this article in a collective letter (it bears 25 signatures):

"It is only thanks to these 'harmful' drugs that thousands of patients return to their families and jobs; thousands of patients who formerly could only be kept at in-patient hospitals are able to live at home.... The call to give up using neuroleptic drugs has disturbed mental patients, has contributed and continues to contribute to their raised aggressiveness toward medical personnel, and serves to complicate further the already dangerous work of the psychiatric profession."

Another detail also cannot fail to cause concern. One of the principles of true democracy is the right to reply publicly to one's opponent (preferably in the same newspaper or publication). However, even the All-Union Association of Neuropathologists and Psychiatrists has been denied this right. The publication of an official reply was also denied to the Moscow Main Health Administration.... It seems that the debate about psychiatry is a monologue and that only one thing is allowed—accusations.

Clearly, there must be no "zones which are outside glasnost," outside criticism. In the case of psychiatry, which is forced—in our interests—to intrude into the sphere of our rights, there is another important aspect: social control. Here the price to be paid for mistakes, violations, and indifference is a special one. However, any discussion of this topic which affects not merely people's interests but their destinies also requires special tact, objectivity, and in particular competence.

It is not out of place to recall that glasnost can easily be used as a screen, from behind which it is easy to expose already known "problem areas" for the sole purpose of exposing them and thus aggravate the problems which have accumulated in society. It is possible to repeat ad nauseam: There are unskilled doctors in our country; there are indifferent doctors; in many psychiatric hospitals conditions do not meet even the minimum requirements; there are impermissible cases of breach of confidentiality by the medical profession; there are cases of moral and ethical norms being flouted by people dealing with medical patients.... How can all this be prevented, how can medical and social assistance to patients with mental disorders be improved? Obviously, the main aim of the debate on psychiatric problems lies in involving the public in the solution of these problems.

However, it appears that in many respects we are not yet ready for a serious debate. "There is no persuasiveness in abuse, and there is no truth where there is no love." If we had accepted these words of Pushkin's as a practical yardstick for a civic stance we would clearly not have to pay today for our apprenticeship in the school of glasnost....

New Rubric for Former 'Taboo' Topics

PM161427 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 10 February 1988 carries on page 6 a new feature entitled "Letters '...Not for Publication'." IZVESTIYA introduces it as follows: "The new rubric is taken from readers' letters to IZVESTIYA. Often a writer will begin (or end) his letter to the paper with the comment: 'You will not publish my letter, but...'

"This skepticism is an echo of days not so long ago when in fact many hard-hitting, topical letters often did not get printed in the newspaper. Even today, admittedly, editorial staff handling the mail sometimes have their doubts: Should we publish? It is after all a highly unusual topic, a strong way of presenting the issue.... But the boundaries of glasnost are visibly widening and there are fewer and fewer taboo subjects. We hope that the new IZVESTIYA rubric will be yet another confirmation of this."

The feature opens with a letter from a man complaining that the "contemptuous epithet 'bum'" is applied even to people such as he who have been reduced to vagrancy because they are unable to to find a job or a place to live. "Judging by newspaper articles," the letter says, "editorial staff believes that only abroad do you find homeless people." IZVESTIYA appends a note to the letter, saying that if the writer approaches a particular official he will be fixed up with a job and a place in a hostel.

There are letters about the need for children to have the whole truth about the "tragic chapters in our history" and about the "changing attitude" toward slogans displayed in public, pointing out the speciousness of some of them.

Another letter is headed "Unwarranted Haste": "In the very center of Krasnoyarsk, next to the branch of the V.I. Lenin Central Museum, a bust of K.U. Chernenko has been erected. The fact that K.U. Chernenko was twice (and subsequently for a third time) awarded the title Hero of Socialist Labor would surprise no one now: In those days this important title was given even to those who were later repudiated by our Soviet laws. But the fact that the bust of K.U. Chernenko was hastily erected in our city is surprising.

"The regulation on the title Hero of Socialist Labor, approved by a USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree of 14 May 1973, says that '...a bronze bust of the Hero with an appropriate inscription will be erected in his birthplace.' But K.U. Chernenko came from the village of Bolshaya Tes in Novoselovskiy Rayon, Krasnoyarskiy Kray, not Krasnoyarsk.

"V. Lopatin, Krasnoyarsk."

There is also a letter from a priest: "In recent years many well-known historians and unbiased and objective writers and journalists have noted the beneficial effect of the Orthodox Church on the formation of the state system in Russ and its role in the development of culture and art and in its conduct of thoroughly rational and highly effective management (particularly in monasteries). As a priest of the Russian Orthodox Church, I believe that the church, in the shape of its priests, can even now make a considerable contribution to accelerating the restructuring of society, to democratization, the establishment of the new thinking, and to instilling in people's hearts and behavior the age-old human standards of morality and conduct. But some local figures with responsibility (essentially irresponsible people) claim that restructuring has no bearing on members of the church, although they are citizens of the country, and the words about restructuring having to take place 'in all spheres of our life' allegedly do not apply to them.

"I do not see why they do not apply. After all, we hold dear everything good and beneficial that is taking place in our country.

"A. Illarionov, priest, subscriber to and reader of IZVESTIYA. Buzuluk, Orenburg Oblast."

Scientific

'Mir' Cosmonauts Prepare for Spacewalk

LD231137 Moscow TASS in English 1116 GMT 23 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 23 TASS—By a TASS correspondent at the Ground Control Center:

Soviet Cosmonauts Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov, who have been working aboard the orbiting platform Mir for two months, are getting ready for a spacewalk.

They have checked their extravehicular activity (EVA) suits for air-tightness, tested their life-support and communications systems, and prepared the equipment and tools they will need on their outing.

The spacemen are putting all these things into the airlock from which they will exit into outer space.

According to the results of a medical examination, Titov and Manarov are feeling well.

The temperature in the platform's living quarters is 20 degrees Centigrade, with atmospheric pressure there running at 739 millimeters of the mercury column.

Soviet Participation 'Highlight' of Space Forum

LD221432 Moscow TASS in English 1254 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] Geneva February 22 TASS—TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

The second international forum Space Commerce-88 opened in Montreux, Switzerland, today. The program includes an exhibition featuring accomplishments in industrial and commercial use of outer space, and a conference, with over 50 specialists from different countries expected to deliver reports.

In the opinion of specialists the highlight of the forum this year is the participation of the USSR which, the press writes, is indisputably in the lead in space exploration, and, moreover, is ready to share its successes with other countries. Glavkosmos (the Chief Administration for the Development and Use of Space Engineering for the Economy and Research), Litsensintorg and other Soviet organizations have put on view scale models of carrier rockets, space vehicles, specimens of information received from outer space.

All-Union Science Conference Opens in Moscow

LD222317 Moscow TASS in English 2227 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 22 TASS—A comprehensive study of man becomes one of the most important conditions for the activation of the human factor, said Soviet Academician Pavel Simonov, known for his works in physiology. He spoke today at the opening of the all-union scientific conference "Problems of Comprehensive Study of Man". The conference is attended by leading scientists of the USSR Academy of Sciences, scientists prominent in every area of the science on man, economists, workers in culture.

Academician Simonov holds that most questions related to man can hardly be resolved in the framework of any separate science. There is a need for the path which will make it possible to reveal unity of the laws of nature and society, unity of natural and social characteristics of a person. Therefore, it is necessary to evolve theoretical concepts which would be effective in several branches of science dealing with the study of man. In this connection, the scientist pointed to the need for specifying such key notions as personality, character, temperament, consciousness.

The problem of the study of man faces scientists with particular acuteness in crucial periods in the life of society when renewal takes place in the economic and social activity, said President of the USSR Academy of Sciences Guriy Marchuk. He said this conference is a natural response of scientists to the process of perestroyka which started in the country. A social expertise of changes that have taken place in Soviet society is greatly needed. And these changes must be judged by criterion of the man, his requirements and motives, capabilities and aspirations, joys and sorrows, Academician Marchuk said.

The conference will last for three days.

Military

Army, Navy Celebrate 70th Anniversary

Zaykov Opens Festivities

LD221724 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1403 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Speech by Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov at a festive meeting devoted to the 70th anniversary of Soviet Army-Navy Day held at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 22 February—live]

[Text] Dear Comrades, esteemed guests from abroad, tomorrow the Soviet people and its servicemen are marking a significant date—the 70th anniversary of the USSR Armed Forces. Allow me to declare open the solemn meeting of the representatives of the working people of Moscow and the servicemen of the capital's garrison devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy. [applause; national anthem]

Comrades, the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers have sent greetings to the servicemen and veterans of the USSR Armed Forces. Allow me to make public the text of those greetings.

Dear comrades, the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers offer heartfelt greetings and congratulations to the servicemen and veterans of the Soviet Armed Forces, the valorous defenders of the Socialist fatherland, on a festival of all the people—the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy. [applause] Born in the crucible of the civil war, guided by the party of Lenin, the Soviet Army and Navy have inherited from the Bolsheviks and Red Guards staunchness and selflessness, fearlessness and heroism, courage and patriotism, ideological conviction and selfless devotion to the cause of the Revolution. Their combat banners are covered with unfading glory. The most impressive pages in the chronicle of military deeds in defense of the gains of Great October are the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War. The brilliant names of a constellation of outstanding military leaders who came from the depths of the people light the military way of the USSR Armed Forces. The motherland honors the feats of the heroes of the October Revolution, the Civil, and Great Patriotic Wars, and of internationalist servicemn with profound gratitude. The Soviet people bow their heads before the memory of those who fell in the defense of our homeland and in the performance of their internationalist duty. Honor and eternal glory to them! [applause]

The USSR Armed Forces are today taking an active part in restructuring and are making a weighty contribution to the implementation of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions aimed at consolidating the country's defensive might. Increasing the qualitative state and the combat power of the Soviet Armed Forces and their combat readiness, strengthening discipline and organization, educating the personnel in the spirit of high ideological and political vigilance, internationalism, combat cooperation with the servicemen of fraternal armies, and loyalty to the revolutionary and combat traditions of the Communist Party and the Soviet people are a most important task of this restructuring. Despite a certain improvement in the international situation, Western imperialist circles do not relinquish hopes for a social revanche, and therefore the party and the Soviet state will continue to do all that is required to maintain the defensive might at a level excluding a military superiority of imperialism over socialism. The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers are firmly confident that soldiers and sailors, sergeants and sergeants-major, warrant officers, officers, generals and admirals of tehe Soviet Army and Navy will perform their sacred duty to the homeland with honor, will vigilantly and reliably guard the Soviet people's constructive labor and the achievements of socialism, and will properly meet the 19th All-Union Party Conference with successes in martial labor. [applause]

Long live the valiant Armed Forces of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics! [applause]

The CPSU Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers. [applause]

Participants Listed

LD221539 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] At the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow, a festive meeting of the representatives of the capital's working people and soldiers of the Moscow garrison dedicated to the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy, is now taking place.

Comrade Gorbachev, Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Ligachev, Nikonov, Ryzhkov, Slyunkov, Solomentsev, Chebrikov, Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, Dolgikh, Maslyukov, Talyzin, Yazov, Baklanov, Biryukova, Dobrynin, Lukyanov, Medvedev, and Kapitonov were met with applause at those assembled.

In the presidium are also leaders of a number of ministries and departments, prominent Soviet military commanders, war veterans, scientists, and representatives of Soviet party and public organizations.

The meeting was opened by Comrade Zaykov, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom. He read out the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and USSR Council of Ministers' greeting. Army General Comrade Yazov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and USSR minister of defense, is presenting a report: 70 years on the guard of socialism and peace.

Yazov Addresses Meeting

PM231405 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Feb 88 Single Edition pp 2-3

[Report delivered by Army General Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR defense minister, to the Kremlin meeting devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy held at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses under the headline "70 Years on Guard Over Socialism and Peace" on 22 February]

[Text] Esteemed friends and foreign guests! We have come together today on the occasion of the celebrated date in the history of our fatherland, the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Armed Forces. This year Soviet Army-Navy Day is noteworthy for being lit up by the light of the recent October festivities crowning 7 decades of the heroic biography of our socialist homeland. In those unforgettable days the eternal flame of our revolution touched the hearts and memories of millions of Soviet people of all ages and nationalities. The October anniversary, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report "October and Restructuring. The Revolution is Continuing" notes, will forever remain in our consciousness as a moment of which to be proud, a moment about which to remember and to think, and as a point from which to look to the future. The present festive day is an integral and constituent part of this moment. The close relation between the date of birth of our socialist fatherland and that of its armed forces is pervaded with very deep meaning. It reflects the revolutionary nature of our army, a child of Great October, its lofty calling to defend the gains of socialism and the power of the working people.

It is with great interest that we have just heard the greeting of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers addressed to the Soviet Army servicemen and the Armed Forces veterans. Let me, on behalf of the whole Army and Naval personnel and war and labor veterans, express cordial gratitude to the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government for the warm words addressed to the defenders of the homeland, and for their constant care about the Armed Forces and strengthening the country's defense.

The greeting reflects the history and the present day of the Army and Navy and gives high appraisal of their role in defending the Soviet people's constructive labor and the achievements of socialism and peace. This appraisal inspires the personnel of the Armed Forces to perform their military duties impeccably. It makes it incumbent upon the servicemen to stubbornly master combat skills, strengthen organization and discipline, and increase combat readiness.

The Soviet Armed Forces have been on guard of the gains of the revolution for 7 decades. The revolution could not exist without military protection. As early as the day after the October victory, the Soviet state declared its adherence to peace, but its peace-loving proposals were turned down. International imperialism imposed a civil war and an armed intervention upon our people. For the Soviet Republic, to be or not to be was the question. By creating the Red Army and Navy, Lenin, the Bolshevist Party, and our country's working people gave the weighty and straightforward answer to this question—to be! The Red fighters and commanders who defended the Soviet power live and will live in the grateful memory of the peoples. The immortal feat of those who won the victory in the Great Patriotic War will shine brightly on this generation and following generations. The heroes who have fallen in battles for our freedom, our happiness and our future will never be forgotten. Honor and glory to all the generations of those who defended the socialist fatherland. It is rightly said that every holiday has its own face. Our holiday has the face of a soldier and defender of homeland. Martial valor and bravery, nobleness and courage are his distinctive features which everyone respects. Our holiday, however, also has other features. These features are love, tenderness, faithfulness, and hope: The love of the people for its sons in military uniforms, the tenderness and faithfulness of mothers and brides, and the country's hope that the Soviet soldier is always on the alert. That is what our common holiday is, a holiday of the whole Soviet people. Our allies, friends, and all the honest people on earth are marking this anniversary with us. They justly see in the Soviet Armed Forces a barrier to the aggressive strivings of imperialism and a reliable bulwark of security and peace. Permit me to heartily greet our comrades in arms from allied countries and all the foreign guests who have arrived for our celebrations.

For us the jubilee is an inspection on the march, an exacting and rigorous inspection. It is a check. A check of our loyalty to Lenin's behests, to patriotic and internationalist duty. A check of our ability to work in a new way, to vigorously carry out restructuring, to fulfill the demands of the party without deviation. A check of our readiness to reliably defend the cause of Great October, the gains of socialism, and peace on earth. The Armed Forces will do everything to be always equal to the demands of the party and of the Soviet people.

1. Army of a New Type [subhead]

Comrades! The task of creating the Armed Forces of a socialist state was one of the most difficult and most responsible which Vladimir Ilich Lenin and the Bolshevik party had to resolve after the victory of the Great October. Never before had such a task been posed, even theoretically. Lenin, like Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, at first looked on the people's militia as a force capable of defending the revolution. But an analysis of the specific conditions in which the Soviet republic found itself, and the real threat of aggression from the imperialist powers convinced him this force could not fulfill the role of defending the revolution. Lenin resolutely abandoned these views. He advanced the idea of organizing a regular army, but a new army of a socialist type, an army indivisible from the people, called upon to defend their interests, an army united by social, ideological, and political unity and conscious discipline, an army boundlessly devoted to proletarian internationalism. Such an army was created.

In February 1918, its first newly-formed units entered the battle with the German interventionists rushing toward Petrograd. At the Narva-Pskov line the enemy was stopped. These were the Red Army units' first battles for the socialist fatherland. They showed the forces of reaction that our revolution is capable of defending itself, and that it has something with which to defend itself. Bitter battles against the White Guards and interventionists lasted more than 3 years. Ill-equipped, "unshod, and hungry," and lacking combat experience, the Red Army routed the well-trained hordes of the internal and external counterrevolution, headed by cadre officers and generals. To this day reactionary historians in the West cannot understand how this could happen.

Such a result, however, is in accordance with objective laws. The Red Army, an integral part of the people, the offspring born of its blood, enjoys its undivided support, and such an army is invincible. The years are powerless over the memory of the heroes of Petrograd and Tsaritsyn, the battles of Kakhovka and Perekop, and the fighting for Volochayevka and Spassk. S.S. Vostretsov, G.D. Gay, V.I. Kikvidze, G.I.Kotovskiy, S.G. Lazo, A. Ya. Parkhomenko, V.I. Chapayev, N.A. Shchors, and other heroes will always serve as an example of courage, heroism, and devotion to the revolution. A worthy place is held in the annals of the Armed Forces by Blyukher, Budennyy, Vatsetis, Voroshilov, Yegorov, Kamenev, Kirov, Kuybyshev, Tukhachevskiy, Fabritsius, Frunze, and other talented military leaders, commanders, and political workers.

The glorious combat traditions of the Soviet Armed Forces were born in the fire of the Civil War. The high degree of combat skill, loyalty to military duty, steadfastness and courage which from time immemorial have distinguished the defenders of the motherland, multiplied by profound consciousness of the great justness of the revolutionary cause, produced an alloy of special durability. The glorious combat road of our armed forces confirms that there is nothing stronger or more reliable than this alloy.

The Civil War demonstrated the great force of proletarian internationalism. This force roused all the nations and peoples of our country to defend the socialist fatherland they had just brought about. It was in the joint struggle that the military-political alliance of the union republics was laid down, which became one of the sources of the Red Army victories. About 250,000 internationalist troops from many countries of the world fought bravely in its ranks in those fearful years. It was to them, in Lenin's words that "the great honor fell to defend the sacred ideas by force of arms, and to implement in reality the international fraternity of the peoples." The republic of the Soviets and the Army felt the constant support of their class brothers and workers from other states. Their decisive actions under the slogan "Hands off Soviet Russia!" weakened the onslaught of international imperialist reaction.

Our armed forces emerged from the furnace of the Civil War stronger, tempered. They were faced with the transition to a situation of peace. It was implemented in difficult conditions. The country was rising from the ruins. The material and technical basis, the foundation of socialism, was being created. The mighty plans for the industrialization of the country, the socialist transformation of agriculture, and the cultural revolution were being implemented.

At the same time it was necessary to take into account the impending threat of a fresh imperialist aggression. It was necessary to strengthen the defense of the country and of the Red Army. An important role in the construction of the Armed Forces was played by the military reform of 1924-25. The party gave the task of directing it to Mikhail Vasiliyevich Frunze. He made a great contribution to the development of Soviet military doctrine, to specific directions in the training and education of the personnel. Many of his ideas and approaches, especially those connected with the implementation of a combined military and political command based on the party, the style of activity of military cadres, and methods for strengthening discipline, keep their relevance even today.

The interwar period revealed new facets of the national character of our armed forces. The country was being transformed. Its armed forces were also being transformed. Their social base was being expanded and strengthened. The formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics contributed to the yet greater international cohesion of the personnel.

The lofty moral and combat qualities of Soviet troops were clearly shown in the military conflicts unleashed by imperialism on the East China Railway, Lake Khasan, and on the Khalkhin-Gol River.

Imperialist reaction, of which the shock force was German Fascism, pressed on with preparation for a new world war. In attempting to avert its being unleashed, the Soviet Union insistently strove for the creation of a system of collective security, but its efforts and initiatives found no response from the western powers. Once embarked upon the path of "appeasing" the aggressor, they stubbornly urged Hitlerite Germany to invade the Soviet Union. The party foresaw the inevitability of a clash with fascism, and undertook measures to better prepare the country and armed forces to repulse aggression, and new weapons and military technology began to come to the troops.

A great role in their creation was played by the outstanding Soviet designers Comrades Grabin, Degtyarov, Ivanov, Ilyushin, Kotin, Koshkin, Petrov, Yakovlev, and many others. The organizational structure of the Army and Navy was improved, and their fighting efficiency increased. Military science and the art of war developed.

Much of what was planned, however, remained incomplete. The time allotted to us by history turned out to be insufficient. We must also not fail to say that there were errors in the armed forces' training. Serious losses were inflicted on our command and political cadres by the repressions which occurred during the period of Stalin's personality cult. All this could not fail to have an effect on the development of events at the beginning of the war, which took on an extremely unfavorable shape for us. Viewing the period between the wars today, we can see clearly what a difficult, complicated and contradictory time it was. We see both the heroic and the tragic, and both great achievements and bitter failures; and, as patriots of our country, we are proud of the fact that precisely during those years our motherland was transformed from a backward, ravaged country into a mighty socialist power. It was precisely at that time that our Soviet character was formed and acquired an irresistible force. It was precisely at that time that the generation of Matrosovs, Smirnovs, Kosmodemyanskayas, Kozhedubovs, Maresyevs, Gastellos, and Klochkovs fostered by the party were raised. This was the generation that shouldered the incredible load of the war imposed on us, stood firm, and won. Fascism brought fire and death to our land. To eliminate the Soviet state, to destroy socialism, to lay waste to our cities, to scatter our national sacred monuments to the winds, to kill millions of Soviet people, and to turn those who remained alive into slaves—these were the aggressor's plans.

All Soviet people, young and old, all the nations and ethnic groups of our country rose to fight in the Great Patriotic War. The ardent appeal of the party "Everything for the front, everything for victory" determined the rhythm of the country's life. Unity of political, economic, and military leadership was provided by the State Defense Committee headed by Stalin. Our homeland's economic and spiritual potential created by the people in the course of socialist construction—everything was mobilized for repelling the enemy. For almost 1,500 days and nights, an unprecedented battle continued. Our country's victory in it was of world historic importance.

By clearing the enemy off their native land, the Soviet fighting men liberated many peoples of Europe and Asia from the aggressor's yoke. By turning today to one of the most complex and heroic chapters of our homeland and of our armed forces, we pay tribute to all who fought against fascism and militarism. At the same time, we have the right to be proud of the fact that the Soviet people and its army made a crucial contribution to defeating Hitlerite Germany and militarist Japan.

The martial valor and the unbending strength of spirit of the Soviet soldier were again clearly in evidence in the battles of the Great Patriotic War. The trooper who has made his trench inaccessible; the officer who marches into battle at the head of the assault troops; the private, marshal, sailor, and admiral—all of them are the flesh and blood of the multinational Soviet people and all of them are courageous soldiers of the motherland.

Soldiers of the motherland are those heroes of the Brest fortress; the defenders of Moscow and Leningrad, of Kiev and Minsk, Stalingrad, Sevastopol and Odessa, Kerch and Tula, Novorossiysk and Murmansk; all those who fought their way to Berlin and Prague; and who fought in the foothills of Bolshoy Khingan. They are the celebrated leaders Zhukov, Rokossovskiy, Vasilevskiy, Konev, Bagramyan, Vatutin, Govorov, Yeremenko, Malinovskiy, Meretskov, Petrov, Tolbukhin, Chernyakovskiy, and other soviet military leaders.

The soldiers of the motherland defended it in mortal combat; honor and eternal glory to them!

All those who fought face to face in the Great Patriotic War with the enemy have, for almost half a century now, been dignified by the proud name of "frontliner." In it we see a man of duty, who, sparing neither his blood nor his very life, fought the enemy. Through all the tribulations he bore his devotion to his military oath, his love for his motherland, and his burning sense of personal responsibility for its destiny. For him the unity of his convictions and his actions became a natural standpoint in life which war has put to the test with its fire. Such were the frontliners in the terrible time of war, and such they have remained to this day. We bow deeply before them.

The victory over the enemy was also forged in the rear. Behind every tonne of metal and fuel, every gun, tank and airplane, and every quintal of grain lay heroic efforts on the part of the workers in the rearguard. Our entire country was a unified fighting camp. The heroic deeds at the front and in the rear melded together. Taking the place of their sons, husbands, brothers, and fathers who had left for the front, elderly veterans of labor, youngsters, and women took over the lathes and the controls of combines. The weapons of victory came in a non-stop flow and in increasing volumes to the Army in the field. The feat of millions, performed on the labor front, will never be forgotten.

I want to say a special word about the heroic wartime woman. She was a loving mother and wife; she was a worker in the grain field, the factory workshop, and the building site; she was also in military service, as pilot, sniper, signals corps member, nurse, and hospital orderly. Our cordial thanks to all of them.

A courageous struggle was waged by the underground partisans on the territories occupied by the enemy. We also celebrate them today, those brave patriots of our motherland.

The crushing of fascism and militarism, and our victory were events of immense significance, a true watershed for the fate of mankind. Prospects for social progress and stable peace opened up before the peoples of the planet. Bellicose circles in the West, however, counting on social revanche, unleashed the anti-Soviet, anticommunist cold war. Its icy winds changed the international political climate for the worse and made the situation in the world unstable. Imperialism, which was guilty of unleasing two wars, was nudging mankind toward a third war, this time a nuclear one.

The intensification of the military threat confronted our country with the necessity to take countermeasures to guarantee its own security. With the deep wounds of the war not yet healed, the Soviet Union was compelled to strengthen its defense and seek ways to deal a worthy rebuff to an aggressor. In the middle of the 1950's, the USSR Armed Forces began to equip themselves with nuclear missiles and other types of modern weaponry. Outstanding Soviet scientists, designers, and engineers—Comrades Aleksandrov, Keldysh, Korolev, Kurchatov, Kalashnikov, Mikoyan, Tupolev, Khariton, Yangel, and many others—made an invaluable contribution to developing and creating it. Soviet military science was raised to a new level. The image of all the branches of the

Armed Forces and all the categories of troops was transformed. The strategic missile forces were created, a mighty defensive shield for our state and the whole socialist community.

The formation in 1955 of the defensive alliance of socialist states, the Warsaw Pact Organization, was an important step in the cause of insuring the reliable defense of the achievements of socialism and of peace in the postwar period; it was a measure taken in response to the setting up of the NATO bloc in 1949 and the growth of its offensive military might. The attainment of military-strategic parity between the Soviet Union and the United States, and between the Warsaw Pact and the NATO bloc was of truly historic importance. It consolidated the positions of socialism and all progressive forces, and overturned imperialist reaction's calculations of victory in a world nuclear war. The fact that reaction did not manage to push mankind into the nuclear abyss is due, in no small measure, to the Armed Forces of the Soviet state.

On the eve of the anniversary we have every reason to say the main trends of Soviet military construction developed by the party have corresponded to the requirements of the time and that their consistent implementation has ensured the Army and Navy's state of readiness to repeal aggression and to provide reliable defense of the peaceful labor and peaceful life of our motherland; and in this lies the historic destiny of the Soviet Armed Forces.

2. Factor of Peace and International Security [subhead]

Comrades, at the CPSU Central Committee April 1985 Plenum, the party made a start on developing and putting into effect its policy of accelerating the social and economic development of Soviet society and for restructuring the entire system of international relations. This was consolidated by the 27th party congress and developed in the decisions taken at subsequent Central Committee plenum. This course is founded on our achievements, on the experience of all the post-October years, and on an in-depth assessment of the contemporary phase of world development.

Comprehension of the realities of the nuclear-missile age and the interests of humanity's survival dictate the need for the new political thinking. This stems from the utter unacceptibility of war as a political means, the futility of striving for military superiority and the senselessness of the arms race. Never before have the problems of war and peace been posed so urgently as at present. Never before has peace been identical with the very possibility of the existence of human civilization, and war with the inevitable destruction of all that lives on earth.

This applies to nuclear war. In the event nuclear war is unleashed by an aggressor, it would inevitably take on global proportions and lead to irreparable, catastrophic consequences for both the sides and for all of humanity. This is also true of conventional war. There has recently been frequent talk in the West of this being permissible. It is hard to say what there is more of here—political speculation, pharisaism, or self-deception. Massive use of conventional weapons and armaments, given their current level of development, would inevitably lead to enormous reciprocal loss. Destruction of modern chemical enterprises and power facilities, including nuclear ones, would have catastrophic consequences comparable with a nucelar cataclysm.

Life has put on the agenda the need for a fundamental restructuring of international relations in accordance with the new political thinking. The document on the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine is permeated with this thinking. It is a strictly defensive doctrine. It is wholly subordinated to dealing with the most important political tasks of the modern day and to preventing war, whether nuclear or conventional.

The allied socialist states have pledged never, under any circumstances, to start military action against anyone, against any state or alliance, if they themselves do not become a target of armed attack. They will never be the first to use nuclear weapons; they have no territorial claims on anybody; they do not view any state or any people as an enemy. Quite the reverse: The countries of the socialist commonwealth are ready to build relations with all the world's countries on the basis of the principle of peaceful coexistence, with mutual account taken of one another's interests and security.

While we support disarmament, at the same time we cannot hand over our destiny to those who continue to build up their military might or who refuse to take part in an agreed reduction of it. That is why our country and her allies are obliged to keep our armed forces in a composition and at a level that would enable them to repeal an outside attack against any state participating in the Warsaw Treaty. They work on the basis of the principle of sufficiency and are making every effort to resolutely lower the level of confrontation and to reduce their military potentials in such a way that the West and the East might have only those forces and means required for defense.

We have never linked—and nor do we now—our future with the military solution of international problems. Our initiatives, proposals, and practical steps toward strengthening peace are universally known. We resolutely and in a principled manner support the reduction and complete destruction of nuclear weapons, the banning of the arms race from space, and the conclusion of a convention banning and eliminating chemical weapons. We propose a radical reduction in Europe of armed forces and conventional weapons, and, as a first step, the removal of the imbalance and assymetry of particular types of such weapons, which have occurred as a result of the historical peculiarities of the building of the armed forces of the sides.

The treaty between the USSR and the United States on eliminating their intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is an example of the fact that the most complex questions can be resolved, provided there is political will. This is the first, and therefore a particularly important step on the way toward real nuclear disarmament. It is only natural that it met with the fervent approval and hope of Soviet people, our allies and friends, and all the progressive and peace-loving forces on earth. Showing its good will and its striving for implementing the provisions of the treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, the Soviet Union will begin in late February to withdraw from the territories of the GDR and the CSSR the missile units equipped with OTR-22 [operational-tactical missiles] missiles, which were stationed there in response to the stationing of U.S. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles in certain West European countries. The Soviet missiles and launchers withdrawn from there will be sent right away to the sites where they are planned to be eliminated following the ratification of the treaty. The Soviet-U.S. treaty on intermediate- and shorter-range missiles also envisions the elimination of these two classes of missiles in Asia, something that is also of fundamental importance for military detente in that region. One must also say that in strict compliance with its defense doctrine, the Soviet Union has not built up its grouping of ground forces in the Far East for several years. Moreover, their numbers along the Soviet-Chinese border have been reduced, and some of our troops have been withdrawan from Mongolia. We are showing restraint also in conducting exercises with troops, and we are not increasing their number and scale. The positive changes in our relations with the PRC is an important factor in promoting the improvement of the situation in the Asian-Pacific region.

The recent statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, in which constructive ways for a political settlement in Afghanistan are set forth, is of immense significance. Work is presently under way in Geneva to prepare a draft treaty on reduction by half of the most threatening and destructive class of nuclear weapons, strategic offensive weapons. This treaty is also awaited with hope by the peoples of the world. But it is only possible to conclude it if there is strict observance of the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972, and if there is no withdrawal from it within an agreed on period. Such a way of posing the issue is dictated by the objective interconnection between strategic offensive and defensive weapons.

The changes for the better taking place in the international situation today cannot fail to gladden one. However, anxiety is aroused by the attempt by reactionary imperialist circles to negate the results of the Washington meeting. With this aim, various actions are being undertaken in a militaristic style, from propaganda fabrications to direct provocations on our frontiers; plans for an upgrading of NATO weapons are being drafted, for the purpose of compensating for an imaginary breach in NATO's defenses, allegedly arising as a consequence of the elimination of U.S. intermediate- and shorter-range missiles; and calls are heard for pressing on with the "Star Wars" program. The Soviet Union resolutely opposes the fact of disarmament in certain areas being accompanied by the development of the arms race in others. If the way is not blocked for such actions, then the whole strategic situation will be destabilized, and the negative consequences of this may be unpredictable. The time in which we live is a time of crucial decisions and actions, of historic significance. It calls insistently for considered assessments of the interrelations between states and for taking into account the interests of both the security of each of them and of universal security. There is a means of setting up that kind of security, to which the Soviet Union is firmly committed, it is by strengthening trust. Implementation of the final document of the Stockholm conference will serve this strengthening in practice. We, like our allies in the Warsaw treaty, are prepared to build relations with all countries including the members of NATO, on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence and mutually taking into account the interests of security.

The level of combat readiness of our armed forces is also determined exclusively by the interests of security. In accordance with the Soviet military doctrine, this must ensure a guaranteed repulse of any aggressor. This tenet of our doctrine in no way makes it identical to the military doctrines of the Western powers. Not one of those, in contrast to our own, contains a refusal to be the first to use nuclear weapons or to unleash war. Moreover, the military doctrines of the imperialist states are, in essence, permeated with the idea of preventive war and, as is well known, that kind of war has always been in the arsenal of an aggressor.

Such an approach is completely foreign to the nature of our state and of the Soviet Armed Forces. From the first days of their existence they have been set to serve not war but peace, not to attack but to defend. Their technical equipment, structure, and training is completely determined by this. Soviet troops are trained and educated in the spirit of strict observance of the lofty international obligations of our country, respect for the principles of the independence, and sovereignty of all states and peoples.

Never, throughout the entire 70 year-long history of our army and navy, have they turned the weapons entrusted to them to an evil purpose; they have never threatened anyone. The malevolent myth long used by reactionary propaganda about the "Red," and now the "Soviet military threat," which appeared in the world immediatly after the victory of Great October and the creation of the Red Army, has nothing to do with reality. This myth was used by imperialism to justify its military intervention against the young Soviet republic, to give a basis to its attempts to isolate it in the international arena. It was used noisily by the Goebbels' propaganda machine as a smokescreen, under cover of which a path was being laid down toward ulimited armament and then toward war for world domination.

Even today it is current among those who have not given up the stereotyped ways of thinking built on dogmas, confrontation, and the "image of the enemy." It is quite evident that progress along the path of mutual understanding, trust, and cooperation, along the path of disarmament and peace is only possible when based on objective reality not on myths. It presupposes a mutually agreed reduction of armed forces and weapons, and the decisive rejection by all states of the threat and use of force.

We Soviet people are immutably devoted to peace, and vitally interested in preserving and consolidating it. Our love of peace has been tested and convincingly proved by the entire history of the Soviet state and its armed forces. It shows, too, that our aspiration for peace in conditions of the real threat of imperialist aggression must go hand in hand with readiness to stand up for ourselves and defend our freedom and independence. This is the starting point of our policy in the defense and security of the country.

Its essence was set out with the utmost clarity by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. "As long as the danger of war remains, as long as social revenge remains the core of the Western militarist circles' strategy," he stressed, "we shall go on doing everything we must to preserve our defense might at a level which precludes the military superiority of imperialism over socialism." This policy is in accordance with the vital interests of our motherland.

3. Following the Course of Restructuring [subhead]

Comrades, revolutionary transformations are being implemented, and restructuring is in progress in all spheres our country's life. The decisions of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which has just taken place, are directed at its further deepening and at the practical implementation of the 27th party congress' directives. The speech which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev made at the plenum presented the ideology of the renewal of Soviet society and defined very important guidelines for concentrating the efforts of the party and the people at the present stage. The servicemen of the Army and the Navy, like all Soviet people, see guidance for action in the programmatic theses of that speech.

The process of restructuring is also deepening in the Armed Forces. Together with the entire country, they have begun its second stage. We see the main task of this stage as the need to raise the Armed Forces to a qualitatively new level, above all through the greatest possible improvement in the style of operation of military cadres, a resolute increase in the efficiency of combat and political training, and universal affirmation of the strict regulation order. The new political and moral atmosphere created in the armed forces during the first stage of restructuring—an atmosphere of a high exacting, principled, responsible, and businesslike attitude—serves the end of steadfast progress toward that goal.

An understanding of the need to increase efforts in everyday work to overcome the existing manifestations of stagnation is deepening among military cadres and among all Army and Navy personnel. These manifestations are seen in shortcomings in the training of Army and Naval forces and in military discipline, and in a lagging behind in the development of the social sphere. Practice testifies that, in spite of the measures being taken, elements of complacency and self-satisfaction are still being manifested in various areas of the life and activity of the Armed Forces. The causes of the "tenacity" of such anomalies include inertia in the thinking of a certain proportion of military cadres and often simply lack of executive performance. The deep-rooted habit of paper-shuffling and ostentation and the mood of freeloading which is still current among individual commanders and political officers are making themselves known. It is manifested in a wait-and-see attitude and a desire to pass responsibility for omissions and the slowing-down of restructuring on to those who are outside the particular military collective or the particular party organization. Notions that the shortcomings will disappear of their own accord if decisions and measures are taken "at the top" have not been eliminated, either.

Such a position runs counter to restructuring. The demand of today is that everybody should operate resolutely and energetically in the sector entrusted to him and in every subdivision and unit and on board ship, and translate political directives into the language of practical deeds.

The process of democratization is unfolding in the Armed Forces, as it is in the whole country. It must be admitted that it is not proceeding simply. Some people are inclined to believe that democratization somehow contradicts the structure of military life and the laws and rules regulating the activity of servicemen. That is a fundamentally incorrect judgment. Democratization is fully in accord with the socialist nature of our armed forces. Its basis is the community of the fundamental interests of all servicemen and their awareness of their immense responsibility to the people for worthy fulfillment of their duty to defend their motherland.

Our regulations have absorbed all the 70-year experience of Soviet military construction. They express the will of the people, which is directed at ensuring the country's security, based on the laws of socialist society and imbued with the spirit of communist ethics and morality. The rights and obligations of servicemen are organically fused in them.

In essence, the democratization of forces life is unthinkable without the rigid and precise fulfillment of the requirements of the oath and the service regulations. Everyone is equal before these requirements—superiors and subordinates. Everyone, from an ordinary soldier up to a marshal, must carry them out. Unalloyed undemocratic administration, arrogance, conceit, rudeness, and anything that degrades human rignity—all of this is absolutely alien to our army. Not only does it have nothing in common with military convention, but it runs directly counter to it; is an intolerable violation of the statutory norms and requirements. To root out such phenomena persistently and uncompromisingly is one of the most important facets of the democratization of the life of our armed forces.

True democracy is possible only when it is based on Soviet laws, and when it is developed and improved in strict accordance with them. It is incompatible with an attitude of anything goes, of irresponsibility and slackness [neispolnitelnost]. Everyone knows that in the Army the order of a one-man commander has the force of law. This is what military convention and the unity of personnel's will and actions rests on. Democratization of army and navy life actively serves to strengthen combined [military and political] command. In our armed forces it is being carried out using the party as a basis. Above all, this means that each leading officer steadfastly implements the policy of the party, relies on the party organization, goes all out to support and develop an active and enterprising approach among communists and the entire personnel, and to guide them to resolving the tasks in hand. The further deepening of restructuring is accompanied by the genuine involvement of all servicemen in taking an active and interested part in the life of the military collective. This is a very important direction for democratization, and at the same time is a test of the maturity of the service personnel and of their ability to work profitably in conditions where people can see everything and pass judgment on everything, and to intelligently do what must be done.

Wherever there are such democratic levers as glasnost, healthy and businesslike criticism and self-criticism are widely used in the struggle against shortocmings, relations which are contrary to statute, and other negative phenomena which still persist in the service environment, there is a real growth in the activity of the personnel, and moves for the better in study, service, and discipline are plain for all to see. As is well known, glasnost troubles only those who work poorly, who carry out their duties in a slipshod manner, who are incompetent, and who preach duplicitous ethics. It is these people who fear glasnost like fire and who try to avoid criticism.

The inclusion of every soldier in the general work is, in the final analysis, the human factor in action. Its activization is a task above all others in the restructuring of the Armed Forces, as throughout our society. The solution depends on many circumstances, one of the most important being attention to a person in military uniform who is fulfilling his sacred duty to defend his homeland—that is, to the Soviet fighting man.

The Soviet fighting man is the soldier and the sailor, the sergeant and the petty officer. For 2-3 years, he is on active service wherever his motherland has sent him. As a rule he is a man with a secondary education. More often than not he joins the ranks straight from school. He is entrusted with first class weapons and terrible fighting technology. To come to grips with them in a short time and to master his combat speciality, all-around knowledge and skills are demanded of the soldier and the sailor, as well as great moral, political, and physical toughness. The foundations of these qualities are laid long before he joins the forces, and the more sound they are, the more closely predraft education and army education come together and the more successfully the soldier develops.

The Soviet fighting man may be an officer. In the absolute majority of cases, this is a man with higher education, often as an engineer. For him military service is a lifetime profession, whose lofty purpose is to defend the motherland. An officer's profession is a profession for brave, selfless, and strong people. The life of an officer is wholly subordinate to the interests of the service, the interests of the security and defense of the motherland. He carries out his duty in mountains and deserts, in tundra and taiga, in different latitudes of the world's oceans, in distant garrisons, in difficult and sometimes in extreme, conditions. At any day and any hour, at any minute, he must be ready to carry out a combat order. Only a person with a high level of ideological awareness, firm will, endurance, calmness, and the ability to take responsibility, to make decisions and to get them implemented, is up to this. The motherland entrusts the officer with people, weapons, and military technology and places great obligations upon him for the training and education of his subordinates, for maintaining the discipline and combat readiness of his subunit, unit, or ship at the proper level. The guarantee of an officer's success is his closeness to his subordinates. To the soldier or sailor, he is not only the commander in chief, but an older comrade, exacting and caring.

The Soviet serviceman is the heir to the military glory of older generations. Few who have taken part in war now remain in the Army or Navy. The sons and even the grandsons of those who went toward our great victory along the roads of the front have long been commanding divisions and regiments. The soldiers and sailors, sergeants and petty officers, warrant officers and midshipmen, officers, generals, and admirals of the eighties are worthily continuing the tradition of selfless service to the cause of October and the Soviet motherland, performing their duty as servicemen with honor.

The glory of our Armed Forces is being multiplied by the military feats of today's servicemen: N. Anfinogenov, G. Namazov, N. Chepik, Shakanis, A. Stovba, and A. Demakov and Z. Chlachidze—these and many other names of Soviet internationalist servicemen have entered the same rank as the names of heroes of the civil war and the Great Patriotic War.

The soldiers and officers who have had to do their military service in Afghanistan rightly enjoy the profound respect of our people. The memory of those who died a valorous death while carrying out their internationalist duty is sacred and will be preserved forever in our hearts.

It is not possible today not to speak of those who are selflessly helping to successfully accomplish the tasks facing the Armed Forces, who with the warmth of their inextinguishable love and their fidelity in separation, their ability to wait, warm the hearts of the defenders of the motherland, strengthen their staunchness, and instill bravery and courage. These are the wives of military servicemen, our friends when we are in combat. On the eve of the anniversary, we address our warmest words and fervent gratitude to them.

The servicemen of the Army and Navy can sense the daily attention and concern of the party, the state, and the people as a whole, anxious to equip the Armed Forces with all that is needed for the successful performance of the tasks facing them. More marked changes are taking place in improving the living conditions, the cultural and daily provision for military personnel and the members of their families. A substantial increase has been made to the daily ration for soldiers from the beginning of this year. The establishment of an anniversary medal for the 70th anniversary of the Armed Forces of the USSR is a new testimony to the concern of the homeland and its high appreciation of military labor. In connection with the Army and Navy anniversary, many servicemen have been granted state awards. Constant attention and increasing concern, and the love and respect of all the people are the inexhaustible live-giving sources of the might of our armed forces. Soviet servicemen express their heartfelt gratitude and thanks for all this to the party and the people.

From the first days of the existence of the Soviet Army and Navy, the working people of our country have considered defense of the socialist fatherland as a sacred duty and service in the Armed Forces as an honorable obligation. To be a defender of the fatherland is a lofty honor for every Soviet citizen. At the same time, this is a huge responsibility for the security of our native land. To be equal to this responsibility, it is necessary to seriously prepare for the fulfillment of our martial duty.

A great contribution to the training and upbringing of a worthy reinforcement for the Army and Navy is made by the family, the school, and the labor collectives. This is the fertile field of work of the Lenin Kosomol, of the All-Union "Znaniye" Society, and of the cultural and arts personnel. An unquenchable supply of patriotism is contained in the works of Sholokhov, Simonov, Gonchar, Bondarev, Alekseyev, Chakovskiy, Ananyev, Proskurin, Isayev, Baklanov, Bykov, Stadnyuk, Karpov, and other Soviet writers. Their books are always with us, and always in the combat ranks. [applause]

The theme of the Great Patriotic War, the theme of exploit in the name of the homeland, is inexhaustible. A profound artistic depiction of life in the modern Armed Forces, an image of the modern serviceman, the heir of heroic combat traditions, are expected. An active role in the upbringing of the younger generation is played by the All-Union Organization of War and Labor Veterans. The role of a reliable assistant and reserve to the Armed Forces is played by the Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Air Force, and Navy, in which every third conscript receives professional training.

Much is done to train young people for worthy fulfillment of their martial duty by internationalist servicemen, everyone who has been through the school of Army and Naval service. At the same time, there is no doubt that we possess considerable possibilities for further enhancing the effectiveness of this most important work. One cannot but see that, here too, vibrant work is frequently replaced by the notorious "gross numbers approach." We often repeat "No one is forgotten; nothing is forgotten." But do we always recognize that this is a slogan which urges action. Unfortunately, it is still not rare for correct words not to be substantiated by actions.

The combat arsenal of our memory, the search for and restoration of the names of the unknown heroes who fell for the homeland, constant concern for war veterans, preservation of the relics of martial valor and glory, knowledge of the combat road of military units and ships and of the exploits of comrades-in-arms—this most rich arsenal must be effective! Attention to history is dictated not simply by an interest in the past; it is vitally essential to us for today's work. Pointing this out, the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum stressed the enormous significance of a truthful portrayal of the history of the Soviet state, part of which is made up by the Armed Forces.

History is often compared with the bonfire of time, in which there is always both fire and ash. Using the weapon of truth, it is important to take from it not the ash but the fire, that purging fire which generates pride and optimism, and gives man the spiritual energy for new accomplishments. This fire has been bequeathed to us by the Leninist Bolsheviks, by the older generations of builders and defenders of socialism. Its reflections lie on the combat banners under which today's servicemen serve. In this regard, it is important to stress that a conversation about the heroic past of our Armed Forces must be combined with a well-argued elucidation of their real contribution to preventing war, and to securing for the Soviet people the possibility of living and working in peace. Attention to the past, to the heroic traditions, must stimulate young people to fulfill with dignity and honor the duty of patriots and internationalists, citizens of our great homeland, the USSR.

Today, as throughout the whole heroic history of the Armed Forces, it is the daily guidance of the Leninist Communist Party which is the main and determining source of their combat might. Party and political work was and is a weapon of a special kind in their hands, embracing all aspects of the life and activity of the Armed Forces. Its lofty efficacy is one of the deciding conditions for the success of restructuring. Communists of the Army and Navy are the main moving force and generator of restructuring.

The party organizations of the Armed Forces, like the whole of our party, are preparing for the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Preparations for it are characterized by a growth in activeness, efficiency, and responsibility among Communists, a strengthening of party influence on solving the task of strengthening discipline, raising vigilance, and combat readiness. "We are obliged to remember that the guiding role of our party has not been handed down from on high for all eternity," Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed at the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum, "but has been won by several generations of Communists, by their wholehearted struggle for socialism, for the interests of the people of labor. Today, every day and every hour, we must confirm and affirm by persistent work on behalf of the people, on behalf of our motherland, our right to be in the vanguard of the revolutionary renewal of society."

For the Communists of the Army and the Navy, being in the vanguard means striving by word and by personal example for a profound understanding by the troops that restructuring means daily intense and selfless work. Being in the vanguard means always being in the midst of the mass of servicemen, knowing their sentiments, responding to the most burning problems in the life of military collectives, and doing everything to resolve them fighting persistently to assert a Leninist style of work, a creative, businesslike style to achieve high final results.

The Army and Navy Komsomol are active helpers of the Communists. They are the combat unit of the All-Union Leninist Komsomol, which marks its glorious 70th anniversary this year. The overwhelming majority of our Armed Forces are young people, and the Komsomol has the most important role in achieving the aims of restructuring Army and Navy life.

Communists and Komsomol members march in the vanguard of socialist competition, which in this jubilee year is being held under the slogan: "Selfless martial labor, model service, and the highest discipline are our contribution to the cause of defending the motherland."

Comrades, at this very time, a new day has started on our Far East border: February 23. For the troops serving there, the festival of the Soviet Army and Navy has already started. Let us go in thought to one of the garrisons in Kamchatka, where a regiment is deployed which can trace its pedigree back to the civil war. At the evening roll call of the First Company on the day of the 70th anniversary of the Armed Forces, as for many years now, the first name to be called will be a name dear to us all, and in the solemn silence a voice will ring out on the right flank: Ulyanov— Lenin, Vladimir Ilich—enrolled as an honorary Red Army man in our company in April 1922."

This moving ritual symbolizes the unbreakable living bond between our Armed Forces, Lenin, and the party. Today, Soviet servicemen again repeat the words of greeting of the delegation of the Armed Forces which was heard at the solemn session in honor of the October jubilee, words about unshakeable fidelity to the behests of Vladimir Ilich Lenin and to the cause of Great October.

The guarantee of the combat might of our Army and Navy lies in this fidelity.

The entire history of the Soviet Armed Forces is the history of dedicated and selfless service to our socialist motherland, and their battle banners are covered in legendary glory. Shoulder to shoulder with the servicemen of the Army and Navy, the border troops and the internal security troops are tackling the tasks set for them. The Soviet Armed Forces, in unified battle order with the fraternal socialist armies, are reliably standing guard over socialism and peace. While marking the 70th anniversary of the Army and Navy, we honor the veterans of former battles; we sing the praises of the Soviet soldier and our valiant Armed Forces. While marking the jubilee, we sing the praises of the Leninist Communist Party, the creator and the leader of the Soviet Army and Navy.

(The report was listened to with great attention and was accompanied by applause).

Bulgaria's Dzhurov Speaks

LD221934 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1534 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Speech delivered by General Dobri Dzhurov, Bulgarian national defense minister, at a festive meeting devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy held at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses—live]

[Text] Dear comrades. Combat friends. To me has fallen the lofty honor of conveying on behalf of the delegations of the armies of the socialist states present here, the heartiest congratulations and the very best wishes to the Soviet people and to its servicemen in connection with the 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy. [applause]

Today we are greeting an army created by the Communist Party, by Vladimir Ilich Lenin, for the defense of the gains of the Great October. Throughout the course of its 70-year history it has fulfilled this task with honor. By its nature, its class character and its historical destiny, it is a genuinely people's army, an army of a new type. The Soviet Army has invariably enjoyed, and does enjoy, the love, respect and support of progressive people of the entire world. The experience of the CPSU and of the Soviet state in creating armed forces of a socialist type is far from being restricted to the national context; it reflects one of the fundamental features of the Great October Socialist Revolution, and is of international importance. This victorious experience is an invaluable gain for the socialist countries.

The heroic path of the Soviet Armed Forces is marked by glorious victories. Their battle banners are covered in glory, which does not fade over the ages, won in fierce confrontations against attempts by world capital to stifle socialism and to destroy the world's first state of workers and peasants. History knows no other examples of such mass heroism as that displayed by the soldiers of the October in the years of the Civil War and then the Great Patriotic War.

Today we note with gratitude that throughout the 70 years of its existence, the Soviet Army has invariably performed as an army of friendship and fraternity among peoples, as an army of liberation, true to its internationalist duty. Today we are honoring the courage, daring, and heroism of the Soviet soldier. The great liberating feat of the Soviet Army will live forever in the memory of our peoples. As evidence of unbounded respect for the Soviet Armed Forces, grateful peoples of many countries have erected magnificent monuments in bronze, marble and granite in honor of the Soviet serviceman and liberator.

Dear comrades and friends. Together with you and with all Soviet people, we are proud that at present the Soviet Armed Forces represent a high level of socialist military organization, and have everything that is required to fulfil the most complicated tasks. They are the armed forces of a state of all the people, of a mighty socialist power. Today's generation of Soviet servicemen is worthily continuing the heroic chronicle of glorious deeds of revolutionaries, Red Guards, of defenders of the Fatherland, and of internationalist servicemen.

In our nuclear and space age, the Soviet Union and other friendly socialist countries are steering a course toward strengthening peace and universal security. Clear evidence of this is the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The Warsaw Pact states have elaborated a strictly defensive military doctrine; at the same time, we remember well the lessons of the past, and as Comrade Gorbachev said at the last CPSU Central Committee Plenum, compromises must be embarked upon on equal terms, without detriment to anyone's security. [applause]

The combat readiness of the Soviet Union's Armed Forces is today being maintained at the proper level, sufficient to give a crushing rebuff to any aggressor. They vigilantly and reliably guard the creative labor of Soviet poeple, and by this token make a big contribution to the cause of consolidation of peace and international security.

On this festive day, may I convey from the personnel of the socialist armies a heartfelt combat greeting to those celebrating their jubilee, the servicemen of the Soviet Army and Navy, and wish them fresh and big successes in combat training and in strengthening the defense capability of their socialist motherland. [applause]

Our warm congratulations and best wishes for their health and success are sent by us today to Soviet veterans, former servicemen, commanders and political workers of the Soviet Army, to those who participated in the partisan movement, and to all the heroes of the front and of the rear, with whom many of the servicemen of our armies fought against the common enemy. [applause]

From this lofty rostrum, we wish the fraternal Soviet people fresh achievements in fulfilling the majestic tasks of communist construction set by the 27th CPSU Congress, a creative and revolutionary boldness in implementing the innovative ideas at the decisive stage of restructuring. [applause]

Glory to the heroic armed forces of the country of the Soviets, created by the great Lenin and the CPSU! [applause] May the friendship and combat cooperation of the peoples and servicemen of our fraternal countries grow stronger! [applause] Long live world peace.

Gareyev Briefs Journalists on Military Doctrine

LD221147 Moscow TASS in English 1132 GMT 22 Feb 88

[Text] Moscow February 22 TASS—The Soviet Union and its allies do not claim greater security for themselves, nor will they agree to lesser.

This idea was stressed at a briefing in Moscow today on the subject "new political thinking and the Soviet military doctrine."

Prominent Soviet military commanders met the journalists. Copl.-Gen. Makhmut Gareyev, deputy chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, pointed out that "life necessitates new political thinking that proceeds, above all, from the premise that nuclear war is totally unacceptable and cannot be won, and the arms race is senseless."

Two inter-related tasks were reflected in the defensive character of the Soviet military doctrine stemming from the USSR's peaceful policy: inadmission of nuclear and conventional war, and the readiness to repulse an aggressor, Gen. Gareyev observed. Stressing that military-strategic parity between the Soviet Union and the United States, Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO remained a decisive factor of preventing war, Gen. Gareyev said, "The clear-cut and firm stand of our country and other socialist nations is that of mutual lowering of strategic balance down to the level sufficient for defence, given total exclusion of nuclear and other weapons of mass annihilation."

Gen. Gareyev stressed the importance of contacts between military experts in Eastern and Western nations.

He said there were plans to hold shortly a meeting between the defence ministers of the Soviet Union and the United States.

Military Attache Gives E. Berlin News Briefing

AU191540 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 18 Feb 88 p 2

[Text] East Berlin (ADN)—The Armed Forces of the Soviet Union led by the party of Lenin have been committed to the humanist tasks of safeguarding peace and socialism since their founding. This was stated by Major General Petr Rybalkin, military, naval and air force attache at the USSR embassy in the GDR, at a news conference in Berlin on Wednesday [17 February] on the occasion of the upcoming 70th anniversary of the Soviet Army and Navy. The glorious traditions of the fight in the Civil War and the Great Fatherland War are being respectfully preserved by today's generation of soldiers. True to the defensive character of the Warsaw Pact military doctrine, together with their brothers-in-arms, the members of the Soviet Army are doing everything to safeguard the peaceful construction work of their peoples at all times.

Major General Rybalkin pointed out the various disarmament initiatives of the USSR, the GDR, and the other socialist states. He stressed the agreement to withdraw the intermediate-range missiles of shorter range deployed on GDR territory in the near future, earlier than originally planned.